

PRESI DI O RESTORATI ON ADVI SORY BOARD
THE OFFICERS CLUB
BUI LDING 50
THE PRESI DI O

January 14, 2003
7: 00 p. m.

Reporter' s Transcript of Proceedi ngs

CLARK REPORTING
2161 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 201
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 486-0700

Freddie Reppond, Reporter

2

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

[Proceedings began at 7: 04 p. m.]

MR. KERN: Call to order. Welcome, everyone,
to the regularly scheduled meeting of the Restoration
Advisory Board.

I'd like to welcome tonight the Presidio Trust
and their contractors; the regulators, both from the
State and the Water Board and the National Park Service.
Welcome, tonight.

And we have some special guests in the
audience from the Army. Welcome to you and members of
public. And, of course, the RAB members and community
members, welcome to you tonight. And happy New Year to
everybody. First meeting of the new year.

Does everybody have an agenda? Are there any
changes or additions tonight? Okay. If there are, as
we go on, please call attention to it.

Any announcements tonight?

Old business? Recently released documents?
Any documents?

Item No. 4.

MR. COOPER: Before we move to Item No. 4, I'd
like to introduce someone that's over here. His name is
Mark Frey. He is a new employee at the Presidio Trust.
And for the RAB members who have been here for a while,
Terry Thomas came to a RAB meeting late last year and

3

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

did a presentation about how the Presidio. After we dig
up a landfill or restore or after we remediate one of
those sites, Terry talked about certain sites are
located where we're going to revegetate with the
historic forest. And Mark is actually going to be the

Presidio RABjan03.txt

6 man on the ground helping us think through a lot of
7 revegetation plans at our remediation sites.

8 And, Mark, if you would just say something
9 about yourself.

10 MR. FREY: I've only been on the staff for
11 couple of months, but I've been spent the last six years
12 in Ohio doing some schooling there. I've worked with
13 the Nature Conservancy and other nonprofits doing
14 revegetation work out there. I'm glad to be on-board
15 here.

16 MR. COOPER: So during the break or after the
17 meeting, if Mark hangs around -- I assume he will -- if
18 you're interested in restoration work and how that works
19 and this document called the VMT, the "Vegetation
20 Management Plan," Mark is going to be our point of
21 contact for all these questions for our remediation
22 program. So we will invite him back for future RAB
23 meetings too.

24 MR. KERN: Item No. 4. We have several
25 members of the audience tonight who are proposed

4

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 additions to our board. We're not going to be able to
2 take Item 4 right now, because we need a couple more
3 people to reach a quorum, which we will expect shortly
4 in the next few minutes. We will cycle back to that.

5 Item No. 5. Let's move ahead to "Works in
6 Discussion," The first one, which is Bruce Handel from
7 the Army Corps of Engineers. He's asked me to pass out
8 some documents. We will get these going.

9 MR. HANDEL: You'll have to forgive me. I was
10 prepared for an electronics show, but we'll just deal
11 with the paper. I think everybody can follow along.

12 I'm here to talk about the Inspiration Point
13 area; provide you an update of Army activities since we
14 became involved probably November time frame. Doug
15 introduced me. My name is Bruce Handel. I work for the
16 Army Corps of Engineers. I'm a project program manager
17 there. As well I'm the Army's point of contact for the
18 Presidio Trust as it relates to matters regarding
19 environmental cleanup that the Army still retains
20 responsibility for.

21 Most of you know that there was a discovery of
22 chemical agents identified here at the Presidio. I
23 believe that was late October. At the time the Presidio
24 Trust notified the Technical Escorts Unit, a unit from
25 the Army, they came out and handled the vials and took

5

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 them away and had them analyzed for the Presidio Trust.
2 Very soon after that, Mr. Cooper notified me. And we
3 came out shortly after that for a site visit. I want to
4 point out specifically that the Army does retain
5 responsibility for chemical weapons and ordnance as well
6 as radiological and biological weapons as it relates to
7 the memorandum of agreement between the Army and the
8 Trust from 1999. Are all of you familiar with that? Do
9 you need any background on that at all?

10 Craig, do you think they understand that?

11 MR. COOPER: Oh, yeah.

12 MR. HANDEL: As I mentioned, the Army Corps of

Presidio RABJan03.txt

13 Engineers came out on November 5th for a site visit. We
14 met with the PSC and the Trust out here. We conducted a
15 site review of some of what we did know about the site
16 and what been done, that type of thing. With myself
17 came some of our folks from our center of expertise in
18 Huntsville. They specialized in chemical weapons
19 ordnance. They were along for the site visit. Not only
20 did we conduct a brief review and walk over the site,
21 but they also completed some limited geophysical work to
22 see what type of information they can get from the first
23 passover of the geophysical.

24 As a result of the site visit and the
25 discussion that day, the Presidio Trust and DTSC asked

6

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 that the Army complete an archive search report as well
2 as they asked that the Army evaluate some soil piles and
3 stockpiled materials that were there at the site. These
4 materials were discovered during some natural resource
5 revegetation activities. It was during the process of
6 moving those materials around that they found the vials,
7 so there was some concern that there may still be vials
8 contained in that soil stockpile. So the Trust and the
9 DTSC asked that the Army retest the soils to make sure
10 that there were no additional vials in there.

11 In terms of archive search report, our offices
12 were utilizing the expertise of our St. Louis district.
13 They specialize in conducting investigative reports and
14 are well versed and are familiar with all the various
15 repositories around the nation. These include the
16 National Archives in Washington, D.C.; NARA facilities
17 in St. Louis; San Bruno here in California. They also
18 looked at the Army's military historical archives,
19 biological Chemical Command office, that type of place
20 around the U.S. And, again, they focused on this as a
21 specialty. So they're in the process of conducting an
22 archive search and they will put it all together in a
23 report for us. That report is expected in June of 2003.

24 To deal with the soils materials and the
25 stockpiles, I talked to our folks from Huntsville. They

7

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 helped me develop the necessary steps to evaluate those
2 stockpiles. Initially, we have to do a probability
3 assessment. And the probability assessment is
4 essentially an evaluation primarily for safety because
5 we're dealing with a potential for chemical weapons, so
6 we're focusing on safety aspects. They go in there and
7 evaluate it as to whether there's a high probability of
8 chemical weapons or a low probability of chemical
9 weapons. It's their feeling, based on discussions, that
10 we can evaluate these soils with a low probability of
11 chemical weapons. What that does is it lessens the
12 amount of safety procedures that we have to go through
13 during the evaluation. It'll be more along the lines of
14 a normal HTRW or environmental safety plan at this
15 point. At least we believe so. The probability
16 assessment needs to be completed. It needs to be
17 approved by the commander at the Huntsville district.

18 After the probability assessment is completed,
19 we can do the scope of work and work contracts, we go

Presidio RABjan03.txt

20 through the planning documents work plan, field work.
21 Will entail basics of some spreading and shifting
22 activities to make sure that there are no more vials.
23 And then at the end we will put an after-action report
24 together.

25 Once we complete the archive search report and

8

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 our evaluation from the soils and stockpiles, we'll
2 develop some type of conceptual models in order to
3 evaluate what it is we have to look at. There is a
4 potential for other sites at the Presidio that need to
5 be looked at. Are they going to suggest or indicate
6 that there were a lot of training activities in this
7 particular area, that type of thing? So, depending on
8 the outcome of the work we do both in the field as well
9 as the archive search report, we'll have to develop a
10 conceptual model and then determine what we need to do
11 next. These options could include anything from
12 conducting additional surveys. We may need to do some
13 site-specific investigations in some of those foxholes
14 out there. There's likely to be an educational program
15 made available to the Presidio Trust and that type of
16 thing. But I think we need to try to see what the
17 information tells us from the archive search report and
18 from our dealing with the soils in the stockpiles before
19 we really know what we need to do.

20 Are there any questions?

21 MR. SUTTER: Yeah. Can the archive report be
22 accelerated? We're looking at five months, at least,
23 until June. Is there any way of accelerating that,
24 because they seem to be a key element in coming to a
25 final evaluation of the potential for additional

9

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 problems with chemical agents on the Presidio.
2 MR. HANDEL: When I asked our St. Louis
3 district, in terms of schedule and cost, to do a report,
4 I asked the same questions. I've reported to you what
5 they told me. Basically, they thought they could cut
6 about a month off it, but we need to remember that they
7 go all around the country to probably a dozen different
8 archives. And it's a very labor-intensive process where
9 they go through boxes and boxes of information. They
10 assemble it all. They look at aerial photographs. They
11 will come to the Presidio. I'm sure they will spend
12 quite a bit of time in the Presidio archives. So it is
13 very labor intensive and takes quite a bit of time in
14 putting the report together. But, again, they thought
15 they might be able to shave a month off.

16 MR. SUTTER: Is the June date sort of an
17 outside date?

18 MR. HANDEL: Yes.

19 MR. SUTTER: Have they indicated confidence
20 that they will be able to meet their due date?

21 MR. HANDEL: That's what they told me.

22 MS. BLUM: If I understood you correctly, you
23 said that they were going to be looking at all
24 possibilities for other training materials so that not
25 be just relegated to mustard gas or mustard vials --

10

Presidio RABjan03.txt

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. HANDEL: Correct.
2 MS. BLUM: -- but would be whatever components
3 might be used in war games, or any other chemicals.
4 MR. HANDEL: There's a variety of chemicals
5 that would fall into the chemical weapons category.
6 They will look at any indication of chemical weapons.
7 They will look at indications of locations where they
8 were firing ordnance. Mark Youngkin provided some
9 limited information from some Presidio newspapers
10 from -- I think it was the '40s -- that indicated that
11 there was some type of military training here with live
12 rounds and land mines.
13 MS. BLUM: Will all of that information
14 finally be released to the RAB and to the Trust?
15 MR. HANDEL: It will be in the archive search
16 report.
17 MR. BOGGS: A time frame for the soils and
18 materials stockpile evaluation? Do we have any idea?
19 MR. HANDEL: We're looking at -- is there any
20 phase in particular that you'd like to understand?
21 MR. BOGGS: My assumption is that the
22 probability assessment is the first thing, so a time
23 frame for that, and a time frame for completing the
24 field version of the report.
25 MR. HANDEL: Probability assessment. Right

11

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 now, we are anticipating a schedule from 27 January to
2 24 February. Scoping and award of contracts takes
3 several weeks, from 17 February to 14 March. In terms
4 of the planning documents, the development and the
5 approval process of work plan, safety plan we're looking
6 at 14 April to 6 June. And the field work from 16 June,
7 taking about two weeks. Could be less. This is a
8 tentative schedule that I received recently from
9 Huntsville.
10 I'd like personally to explore the planning
11 documents. I want to see if that's something that can
12 be done in-house. It takes a long time just to get to
13 the point with a contractor to develop the work plans.
14 So I'm hoping it's something we can do in-house with
15 some Huntsville staff that will help us out. It takes a
16 long time for a contractor to develop a work plan, so
17 I'm considering using someone in-house.
18 MR. NELSON: You'll be choosing from a variety
19 of contractors to do this work, or does Huntsville
20 provide some people in that pool as well?
21 MR. HANDEL: Actually, I have asked Huntsville
22 to utilize their contractors since they specialize in
23 chemical weapons.
24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In the other
25 evaluation, how large is the area? Do you know how it's

12

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 going to be studied? Is it secured at this time?
2 MR. HANDEL: The site itself is probably just
3 three to four acres, something like that. But the
4 archive search report will be for the entire Presidio.
5 MR. PONTON: Bruce, thanks for your

6 presentation. I see that education is an option that
7 follows through this process. And I guess what I'm
8 interested in is, is there going to be effort put forth
9 by your agency to make sure that the NPS and the
10 Presidio Trust are working under appropriate health and
11 safety protocols now in the short term, given what's
12 been found just because of the volunteers involved and
13 whether they have appropriate signage up and whether
14 things are being communicated to everyone as they need
15 to be communicated? So I guess I don't see the
16 education part of it as something that needs to wait
17 till the end.

18 MR. HANDEL: I believe that the Trust has
19 fenced the area off and requested NTSC to put some
20 signage there. They have conducted some evening
21 meetings for the residents in that area. I believe
22 they've also modified their work practices, updated some
23 safety plans. And I have asked that they forward that
24 information to the Army so we can see if it meets our
25 requirements.

13

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. BERMAN: Two questions. In the archive
2 search, is there indication that there's information
3 related to the Presidio and other archival institutions
4 other than the Presidio itself?

5 MR. HANDEL: Yes, there are.

6 MR. BERMAN: In reference to the type of or
7 possibility of some chemical?

8 MR. HANDEL: Yes. I talked to our folks from
9 the St. Louis district. They had indicated to me that
10 they found several boxes of information -- I'm not sure
11 if it was in Washington, D.C., or in Maryland -- about
12 the Presidio, about materials that were used here,
13 details that weren't seen before.

14 MR. BERMAN: One thing that puzzles me here:
15 It's clear that there will have to be some examination
16 of the piles of the materials that's there. It seems
17 that that is not going to occur until sometime in June.
18 And, given your preliminary assessment that it's
19 probably not anything serious, that there's a low
20 probability, it seems to be a rather long period of time
21 to look at few piles of dirt. I've been out there and
22 looked to see how much material is there; and it can't
23 be more than few truckloads.

24 MR. HANDEL: I can appreciate that. Keep in
25 mind that the people we have doing this, they're the

14

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 center of expertise for the Army for chemical weapons
2 and there are specific requirements that need to be
3 followed. It's for the safety of themselves as well as
4 the public. They need to be certain the evaluation
5 needs to be accepted and approved at higher levels than
6 a normal working group. For example, if I were doing a
7 normal environmental cleanup, I wouldn't need that type
8 of level of approval. It would basically stop at the
9 project manager level, and your safety office would
10 review and approve the safety plan. This being chemical
11 weapons, they basically don't want to take any chance,
12 so that's the probability assessment portion.

Presidio RABJan03.txt

13 In terms of the duration, it does seem long.
14 Keep in mind we have to do the probability assessment
15 first. Before we can complete the scoping and develop
16 the scope of work the contractors can bid on, we need to
17 know exactly what's going to be done. The bids have to
18 be processed. It has to go out for an award. The
19 contractor needs time to put a proposal together.
20 There's an evaluation and selection process. There's an
21 award that a contractor has a short period of time
22 before he begins, usually a week to ten days' notice to
23 proceed. So I can appreciate that it does look like a
24 long period of time. Each one of these steps are
25 required by the federal acquisition requirements, so we

15

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 do not have a choice. That's why I was thinking we can
2 do some of this work in-house, developing the work plan
3 and the contracting part to just cleanup assisting.
4 MR. BERMAN: Could you venture a guess of what
5 you think the cost of this overall exercise will be?
6 MR. HANDEL: The archive search is estimated
7 at about \$135,000. I've estimated the cost of
8 development of the planning documents and the site work
9 to be between \$75,000 and \$100,000.
10 MR. BERMAN: So the total is about \$200,000.
11 MR. HANDEL: Depending on what we find out, we
12 may need to do a more exhaustive effort out there; or it
13 may be fairly limited. Could range in price from, say,
14 a limited investigation \$50,000 to \$100,000. It depends
15 on the complexity.
16 MR. SUTTER: These costs are all the Army's
17 nickel?
18 MR. HANDEL: Correct.
19 MS. CHEEVER: Is the archival research going
20 to cover all the Presidio or only this one area?
21 MR. HANDEL: The whole Presidio.
22 MS. CHEEVER: That's one advantage of spending
23 the money. That's one benefit of what we get from that.
24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A hypothetical
25 question. What if the archive search turned out to not

16

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 find anything about this agent's use at any point at the
2 Presidio? What would happen then?
3 MR. HANDEL: We would probably discuss it
4 internally. And I would think that we would believe
5 that the archive search work is not quite accurate. We
6 know that there was something done here. But I don't
7 think that'll be the outcome. I have seen some
8 information that was obtained through St. Louis district
9 where we know that there were materials sent here for
10 training. Between that information and the information
11 Mark Youngkin indicated and brought forward, we know
12 that there was some activities occurring here. We just
13 don't know to what extent.
14 MS. TRIGIANI: I apologize if you addressed
15 this in the opening remarks, but does an archive search
16 include maps of all the training grounds on Presidio as
17 well so it will provide that information?
18 MR. HANDEL: That'll be the hope. We will
19 definitely look through as many as maps as we can --

Presidio RABjan03.txt

maps are a great resource -- to determine what's occurred and where it's occurred. And the Park Service archive has a great number of maps. So most of the map information will come from the Presidio here. It's hard to say what may show up.

MS. TRIGIANI: It's a follow-up to the

17

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

question that was just asked about. If there's no record where we didn't use mustard agents on Presidio, I thought if we knew where all the training grounds were, we could do some preliminary checking.

MR. HANDEL: That would be one of the objectives of the archive search report, to identify locations that were likely or known for this type of training.

MARY: Because we don't have a sense of that right now, do we, Doug?

MR. KERN: I think we've done a pretty exhaustive look at maps.

MR. YOUNGKIN: It's kind of surprising that you don't really see anything that shows training grounds on it. And that's kind of surprised us all that those have turned up, because we go through a lot of maps, even maps marked "danger areas." I don't remember seeing any training grounds on there. So I'm not sure why they didn't mark those. I guess they weren't permanent structures or something.

MR. HANDEL: Quite honestly, I was surprised at the call in October. I had felt that the Army did quite a bit of research in the years between '89 and '97, when I left. So I was quite surprised that this turned up. We had found two or three items of ordnance

18

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

over the years that were cleaned up, but no indication of anything else.

MR. YOUNGKIN: I looked through the Internet a little bit for stuff on this and there are quite a few FUD sites that seemed to turn this up. You do have experience with this. The Corps of Engineers has worked with this, so this isn't really new territory.

MR. HANDEL: No.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Can you give us sort of the usual scenario that happens at these FUD sites?

MR. KERN: "FUD" means . . .

MR. YOUNGKIN: "Formerly used defense site."

MR. HANDEL: These are facilities that were at one time or another owned and operated by the Department of Defense. They could be Air Force or Army or Navy. And the property was put up for sale or turned over to the public, so that's basically a FUD site. To my knowledge, I only know of one FUD site -- and that's Santa Rosa Naval Auxiliary Air Station -- where any of these chemical weapon kits were found, but that doesn't mean that are others in the state or other states. One thing to keep in mind is that these vials or these bottles, their purpose was to train the soldiers as to what mustard gas smelled like, how to decontaminate themselves or their equipment if it was exposed to

19

Presidio RABjan03.txt
CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 mustard gas. So the purpose of it here was really for
2 training staff.
3 MR. NELSON: So these weren't warfare agents
4 of the quantity and concentration where someone could
5 actually be injured if they were exposed to it?
6 MR. HANDEL: The mustard residues were a
7 blistering agent. And I would say, without truly
8 knowing the details, I know it has a potential for
9 blistering skin. But I don't know if the concentration
10 of what was in this bottle versus what would have been
11 used in Europe or something. There were different
12 materials that were stimulants, but mustard gas vials
13 were encased in mustard residue.
14 MR. SUTTER: Do you know at this time if there
15 was specific periods in the history of the Presidio when
16 these kinds of agents would have been used for training
17 purposes?
18 MR. HANDEL: I believe, without knowing the
19 true details, I believe post-World War I and along into
20 World War II, but I don't think much past 1945. But
21 again that's just a guess.
22 MR. SUTTER: And the archival information
23 probably would indicate any other agents or even this
24 agent that was used here. This would also indicate the
25 lifetime or how long these agents would still be

20

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 dangerous so that we would get some information
2 presumably in the final report if there are
3 such-and-such agents that were used 50 years ago by this
4 time that would probably not be dangerous at this point?
5 That kind of information would be provided, do you
6 think?
7 MR. HANDEL: The archive search report
8 probably won't go into that detail. I would have to --
9 our center of expertise in Huntsville for that
10 knowledge. There are folks in the Army Corps of
11 Engineers who specialize in that kind of information --
12 so that would have that expertise. We would bring them
13 in the picture when we want to develop a conceptual
14 model. Once we have the information as to what the time
15 is, we can determine whether we need to be concerned
16 what direction do we go in.
17 MR. YOUNGKIN: Are funds available to do this?
18 MR. HANDEL: I've been told by the RAB office
19 that funds are available. Of course, they will have to
20 be taken away from somebody else's facility, but the
21 dollar amount is not excessive?
22 MR. KERN: Any other questions for Bruce?
23 Thank you very much for your presentation.
24 MR. KERN: We might have a quorum, so we can
25 cycle back to Item No. 4.

21

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Mark, do you have a meeting report?
2 MR. YOUNGKIN: We didn't have a committee
3 meeting during December, so the next meeting is the
4 fourth Tuesday in January.
5 MR. KERN: Very good. I'd like to turn it

6 over to you, Jan.
7 MS. BLUM: There's a handout on the table that
8 outlines the slate of new members. The membership
9 committee is Mark, Doug, Julie, Dennis, David, Joel,
10 Gloria, and I. We reviewed all 64 applications and
11 narrowed it down to these seven people that we would
12 like to recommend. I'd like to introduce everybody. I
13 don't know if everybody that is on our list is here
14 tonight or not. Is Sean Pedro here tonight? George
15 Deese? Marianne, I know, is here. John Leuckart.
16 Suzanne Novotney. John Rosenberg. And Sara Siegel.
17 MR. KERN: Excellent. Anything before we move
18 this item?
19 MS. BLUM: This is the recommendation of the
20 membership committee that we accept these seven members.
21 And I guess we're looking for somebody to second the
22 vote.
23 MR. SUTTER: Second the motion.
24 MR. KERN: So there's a motion to accept this
25 slate of new members as proposed by the selection

22

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 committee. Is there any other discussion?
2 All in favor, aye?
3 [A VOICE VOTE WAS TAKEN.]
4 Opposed?
5 So that would be unanimous acceptance of the
6 slate of new members.
7 MS. CHEEVER: There's one RAB member, Gloria
8 Yaros, who couldn't come, but she actually gave a proxy
9 to us, but is very eager to have her vote known as a way
10 of welcoming new members. So whether it's counted or
11 not, I'd like to mention that.
12 MR. KERN: We have nine members here tonight,
13 so we should at least count the nine. And then we'll
14 note for the record that Gloria also wanted to put her
15 vote in there.
16 So we very much like to welcome those of you
17 and the other members to our board. And perhaps we can
18 meet you at the break and chat a little bit among
19 various people here on the board.
20 And it's something that I usually say at these
21 meetings when new members are brought on, it takes a
22 while to get used to all the terminology and names. You
23 should ask many questions and sort of elbow your way in.
24 We all had to do it, so that's the style. Just come on
25 and make yourself at home. Thank you for your

23

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 application, and congratulations and welcome to the
2 board.
3 MS. BLUM: We put out extra chairs if they
4 want to come and sit at the table.
5 I'd just like to say thank you to the
6 membership committee for wading through 64 applications,
7 which is horrendous, and for doing such a fine job of
8 getting so many people with excellent backgrounds. It
9 really looks very, very promising.
10 MR. KERN: I think Jan and Julie and a number
11 of people on the committee did a huge amount of work,
12 starting off with Craig getting the advertisements just

Presidio RABjan03.txt

13 right and making sure it went out in all the right
14 papers. It's a very long process and I think it's
15 served us well in the years. The meetings that reviewed
16 the applications are always very interesting. We had a
17 good time and considered them all very seriously. So
18 it's something that we put a lot of time into. I'd like
19 to echo your comments and thank all those members on the
20 committee for your time as volunteers.

21 Any other comments on the new members?

22 There will be probably be some orientation
23 things that you can expect, receive little packages of
24 information, maps, tours. In fact, there is a site
25 right now -- Landfill 4 -- I was by there today, where

24

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 there is excavation of landfill proceeding just today.
2 In fact, the contractors were pretty aware, and they
3 didn't allow me on the site, which was probably the
4 right activity for them. I didn't have any kind of
5 bandage or helmet or steel-toed boots or anything of
6 that kind. But there is quite a bit of activity among
7 our sites. So it might an interesting place to give a
8 tour in the near term.

9 Any other comments? All right. Thank you.

10 Moving on. Item No. 5-B. Probably Craig.

11 Since I don't see George here tonight

12 MR. COOPER: All right. My name is Craig
13 Cooper. I work for the Presidio Trust. And I'm
14 substituting for George Ford tonight. And for the new
15 RAB members, this is a typical agenda item where myself
16 and Chris Nelson, who will speak in a minute here,
17 provide an overview of the status of the remediation
18 projects that we're working.

19 Again, I'd like to reiterate what Doug said to
20 the new members about don't be shy about interrupting
21 and asking questions. That's how you learn all the
22 acronyms and the process and the sooner you learn and
23 can contribute more to the process itself.

24 I'm going to give you these handouts.

25 For a site tour, there was another idea.

25

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 Maybe at the next committee meeting or next RAB meeting
2 for new members, let's see if we can organize another
3 site tour for new members. New members, keep that in
4 mind. So I think everyone got a map. Did everyone get
5 a map? So you can start looking at the map. Our
6 website is another place where maybe you've been to
7 already so you start to collect information there.

8 Bruce Handel is here to talk about this
9 particular site, Inspiration Point, where the mustard
10 agent bottles were found. I have briefed the RAB a
11 couple times now in the past in more detail about what
12 happened and what are we doing to do and what the Trust
13 is going to do about it. And in response, I think it
14 was Sara's question, the site is secure. As soon as the
15 agent bottles were found, we put up caution tape to
16 tell people right a way that this was a place where we
17 really don't want people tromping around. And after we
18 took the caution tape down, we put up that security
19 fence that now completely encircles what we think is a

Presidio RABjan03.txt

20 former military training zone. There's some
21 indentations in the landscape there that were uncovered
22 when the revegetation folks took away all of the
23 overbrush. It was uncovered. We think those might be
24 former foxholes. We don't know for sure. But that's
25 what Bruce's archive search report might shed some more

26

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 light on that before we do further investigation. The
2 site is secure. We put up a fence, but we're going to
3 bill the Army for that. We are now waiting on the
4 assessments. I was very interested to see Bruce's
5 presentation. Some of it was pretty much what I
6 expected. Some of it wasn't. I don't know if he's
7 still here. Personally, I will tell you that I sent him
8 a letter on January 10, that I copied Doug and Mark
9 about. And speaking on correspondence, we are going to
10 launch a link on our website so you can start to see all
11 correspondence, just that kind of stuff. When that link
12 is developed, which hopefully will be within the next
13 month or two, not only I will immediately attach some
14 important old correspondence that I've written in the
15 last six months or so and any new letter that I write
16 will immediately get stuck on that link. So if you hear
17 about it at a RAB meeting, you can visit that link
18 occasionally. And then when you hear about a letter at
19 RAB meeting you can go that night home and read the
20 letter.

21 MR. BERMAN: Is that a secure site?

22 MR. COOPER: It will probably have a password.
23 I think that's the only way to control it right now.
24 Right now, any correspondence that we -- to start
25 putting documents on there too because a lot of our

27

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 contractors are sending us documents on CDs and stuff
2 like that. We just started popping those documents up
3 electronically.
4 Anyway, this letter basically says pretty much
5 along the same lines as Bruce's approach. But as far as
6 time frames it has -- again, it's Trust expectations of
7 how we want the Army to perform; and our time frames are
8 a little bit more aggressive. And I didn't discuss
9 them, obviously, with Bruce in advance, so you can read
10 my letter about what I think when they should finish
11 archival search report and sifting through the
12 stockpiles and so on.

13 MR. KERN: What date did you propose?

14 MR. COOPER: I wanted the sifting soils to be
15 completed by March 15th. So -- that's to keep the
16 pressure on. I wanted the archive search report to be
17 done by March 1st and to get the results by March 15th.

18 Any questions for me on this point? I know
19 that you asked Bruce a lot of questions.

20 Other than the things we talked about, our
21 remediation sites are in three major categories. We
22 have a petroleum program, which are sites that are
23 primarily contaminated with petroleum hydrocarbons. And
24 Jim Ponton from the Regional Water Board is our main
25 regulator for those sites.

28

Presidio RABJan03.txt
CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 And then we have sites that we call CERCLA
2 sites, which are sites that are primarily contaminated
3 with hazardous substances, which are chemicals other
4 than petroleum products. Bob Boggs from DTSC is our
5 main regulator for those sites.
6 Our third category of sites are lead-based
7 paints in soils, which is basically lead paint that's
8 still on the ground from painting operations.
9 Those are the three main categories of sites.
10 We've got budgets. And we can talk about how much we're
11 going to spend in each program.
12 All right. So in our petroleum program,
13 basically this is under Jim Ponton's purview. When we
14 first took over the Presidio from the Army, we inherited
15 two orders that the Regional Water Board sent the Army.
16 And those orders have been in place for quite a while.
17 And we've been using those orders to do our petroleum
18 cleanups to date. And the Regional Water Board recently
19 announced that that they would like to get an update on
20 those orders. Maybe Jim can talk about this a little
21 bit. I know that you're in the process now of updating
22 those order more up to date to what actually the
23 petroleum program looks like. So stay tuned for that.
24 And also, just kind of as an internal tracking
25 process, there's a lot of underground storage tanks.

29

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 There's a lot of these underground tanks that the Army
2 removed, but they left soil contamination encapped. We
3 produced our own internal tracking documents for all our
4 petroleum cleanup plan.
5 That was a very brief overview. There's a lot
6 of work going on there. These are kind of two projects
7 that are going on right now.
8 Now we're going to talk about programs going
9 on in our CERCLA program. That's pretty much Crissy
10 Field work; pretty much all the remediation work there
11 is done. There's a little bit of odds and ends going on
12 and some report writing. We had to move around some
13 riprap to conduct a cleanup. Recent storms have caused
14 some erosion in the same area where we did the skeet
15 range cleanup. And because that erosion happened
16 shortly after our cleanup, we need to fix the erosion to
17 the coastline. So we hired an expert because this site
18 cleanup is down in Area A of the Presidio, which is
19 actually administered by the Park Service, so we have
20 been in contact with Brian's group and the Park
21 Association, so we hired an expert to figure out what
22 the best way is to stabilize our remediation site there
23 so when storms come in in the future the land does not
24 erode away.

25 Another part of the cleanup is at Fill Site 7.

30

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 That's work that the Army did a while ago. We're
2 writing a RAP report on that. And we've gotten comments
3 from the Regional Board. And Bob Boggs says he has
4 comments ready to go.
5 MS. BLUM: So the erosion repair and design

6 project, will that be remediation money or will it be
7 Trust money or Park money?

8 MR. COOPER: It will be remediation money. I
9 feel that the erosion occurred so shortly after our
10 remediation work, I think there was a direct connection
11 between this particular erosion problem with the work
12 that we did there. If the erosion happened a
13 considerable amount of time after we said we were done,
14 then I would say that's not a remediation problem
15 anymore, but because this particular problem kicked up
16 within months of the first storm after remediation.

17 MR. BERMAN: Was the riprap actually put back?

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: No. Some of the riprap was
19 left off that area. And that was part of consideration,
20 because it's not consistent with the Park Service
21 policies and a number of reasons why minimizing it was
22 generally good. There was some riprap that was moved or
23 removed.

24 MR. BERMAN: But the purpose of riprap is in
25 fact to prevent erosion. That's why it was put there.

31

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: But the original placement of
2 the riprap put there by the Army was much more extensive
3 of what was there prior to the Trust starting their
4 work. The riprap was significantly reduced during the
5 Crissy Field restoration project. And riprap science
6 being as it is, there's an exact prescription to how
7 much is the right amount.

8 MR. SUTTER: That brings up an interesting
9 question though. How do you determine, given the
10 remediation project's impact upon the topography of an
11 area if that area is subject to subsequent erosion, what
12 kind of cause-and-effect formula do you apply?

13 MR. COOPER: First of all, I think for
14 remediation -- to get some type of time frame,
15 especially for the sites that are in Area A. I have not
16 talked to Brian in detail about this, but eventually,
17 regardless, for remediation to be involved there needs
18 to be potential for an actual release of hazardous
19 substances into the environment. So that's what got us
20 involved, that erosion occurred and we got concerned
21 about a potential release. We don't believe that
22 happened, because we got back in there quickly enough to
23 do some temporary sandbagging of the area to resecure
24 the site. So as far as how much time goes by --

25 MR. SUTTER: I'm not talking about time. I'm

32

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 talking about cause and effect. If there's erosion in
2 an area, does anybody analyze whether that erosion was a
3 result of the remediation project or just the result of
4 general rainwater?

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I would suggest that if it
6 appears from just the physical evidence that the erosion
7 is caused by or significantly contributed to from the
8 Trust's activities at the remediation site that they
9 would then come in and correct that problem. I think
10 that's where the time frame comes in. If a decade later
11 there's erosion at the site it would probably not be a
12 direct result of remediation. But since it was the

Presidio RABjan03.txt

13 first major storm after remediation and was exactly and
14 only were the remediation occurred it was fairly
15 apparent that there was a cause and effect there. If it
16 had been somewhat nebulous, we might not be having this
17 discussion.

18 MR. SUTTER: I'm just concerned that the
19 remediation budget doesn't get eroded.

20 MR. COOPER: I want an exit strategy on this.
21 And if site certification from the regulators and
22 transfer and the Park Service says it's in Area A now,
23 that's where I'm concerned.

24 MR. BOGGS: I was going to say there is a
25 requirement when they do remediation that the site has

33

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 to be restored so that erosion does not happen and that
2 problems such as what occurred. It probably wasn't
3 easily foreseeable that that would happen at this
4 location. But, for example, at Landfill 4 and Fill Site
5 that is a required component of remediation.

6 MS. TRIGIANI: So we are still trying to
7 figure out what broke down in the process to cause the
8 erosion, or do we know was there -- was it ineffective
9 work or --

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: I guess at this point, I
11 would say that it's generally accepted that not
12 replacing some of the riprap was the major contributor
13 to the erosion. Obviously, the storm was the most
14 devastating, but some of the riprap had been removed and
15 not moved back.

16 MS. TRIGIANI: Who did the work?

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Trust.

18 MS. TRIGIANI: Our own employees?

19 MR. COOPER: The contractors.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: But they were following the
21 directions of Trust, so I don't think we can necessarily
22 blame the contractor. It wasn't that they did something
23 short of what they should have done. It was that the
24 conceptual design as it was implemented just didn't put
25 enough riprap on the site.

34

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1
2 MS. TRIGIANI: The reason I ask this is to
3 just raise the issue so that money does not get dripped
4 and drabbed away. I want to understand how you do the
5 cause-and-effect thing and what gets you to the point
6 where you realize something comes out of our budget
7 rather than something that requires more discussion.

8 MR. COOPER: There's other components of
9 Crissy Field's closure. There is Building 900 there.
10 We are working on the construction completion report
11 for -- Treadwell & Rollo are working on -- all the
12 components of Crissy Field closure. There's individual
13 components that we put into one big document, called the
14 Crissy Field Closure and Request for Partial Site
15 Mitigation. We have to say partial, because at the
16 Building 900 area there's some groundwater monitoring
17 that has to go on for a couple more years. But this
18 will be the most important document because it pulls
19 together all the Army's work, all the Trust's work

Presidio RABJan03.txt

20 there, pulls it all together and explains to the
21 regulators that we're done, we've met the cleanup
22 standards, and certify us as being complete for the
23 cleaned-up soils, and we'll continue to do the
24 groundwater monitoring. When we finish the groundwater
25 monitoring, if it comes out okay, then we'll come in

35

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 with one final request to certify the entire area as
2 complete.

3 MR. KERN: The groundwater monitoring at the
4 site a few years was a problem. It was going to be an
5 ongoing problem and potentially even a cleanup. Then
6 there were issues with the Army and it was negotiated
7 not to do a cleanup and just to do monitoring. Do you
8 have a feeling for where that site is now? Are we still
9 getting indications of contamination; or is it pretty
10 much attenuated? Do you know?

11 MR. COOPER: I don't have a feel for the data.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: One of the things which
13 complicates that answer is that a series of new wells
14 went in recently. And so getting a time series on the
15 new wells hasn't happened yet, but groundwater currently
16 does not meet drinking water standards. There have been
17 no exceeding cleanup levels at any of the wells,
18 including the new ones, but the cleanup levels are set
19 at the time of RAB [inaudible]

20 MR. BOGGS: As far as what is involved in site
21 certification, DTSC does certify sites where there is
22 ongoing monitoring. So for us to be able to certify the
23 site we just need a body of evidence that shows that
24 that remediation that was done seems to be sufficient.
25 So it could be a year or two. Now, the monitoring will

36

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 probably be required for a long time. But essentially
2 their construction and the actual work is complete.
3 Part of the certification and one of the things that
4 needs to be worked out is land-use controls, or LUC.
5 That water doesn't meet drinking water standards so
6 there will be somewhere recorded that they can't put a
7 drinking water well in Building 979. So the
8 certification can go forward, provided there's a body of
9 evidence that shows that what was done was and is likely
10 to be monitored as well.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why were the new wells
12 dug?

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: As part of a remedy. And the
14 remedy, condensing the description of it, removal of a
15 fair amount of contaminated soil and confirmation or
16 monitoring of groundwater. In the process both of
17 implementing the soil remediation and doing the Crissy
18 Field restoration work, a number of existing wells had
19 to be removed and it did not lead an adequate or
20 appropriate array of wells to do monitoring so new wells
21 were put in; and because of the construction sequencing
22 it was appropriate to put those in at the end of the
23 project.

24 MR. COOPER: Next, there's another action
25 right down at the far eastern edge of Crissy Field,

37

Presidio RABjan03.txt
CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 called the DEH area. That's in the closure program
2 also, right in the reports. The Trust actually sent the
3 agencies a draft report a while ago. We got some
4 feedback from the agencies on that. It's not caused us
5 to rewrite it. And the Trust is just about done with
6 that. We're going to send our rewrite of that report to
7 the Park Service by the end of this week. And so, once
8 we get the Park Service's concurrence on that, we'll
9 send it off to the agencies again. And hopefully that
10 report will be in better shape to address the agencies'
11 concerns on that.

12 MR. KERN: "DEH" actually stands for
13 something -- Director of Engineering Housing. It was a
14 group of buildings at the east end of Crissy Field,
15 which have been demolished and are no longer there.

16 MS. CHEEVER: For the record, there's somebody
17 sitting at this table who took the lead in writing the
18 cleanup plan for DEH. That was the first CERCLA
19 cleanup. And that's Brian. So congratulations, Brian.
20 It's almost there. It was in 1996.

21 MR. COOPER: Next, the lead-based paint in
22 soils program. The Trust has been doing some lead-based
23 soils cleanups. And at the same time we've decided to
24 write our lead-based paint -- LPB -- into a plan, a
25 technical work-plan approach. We basically are going to

38

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 be explain what our procedures are. When we come to a
2 building, how do we decide whether the soil is clean or
3 not clean? Where do we sample? How often do we sample?
4 If soil is contaminated, what are our cleanup levels?
5 How do we do the cleanup? So that's what this plan is
6 about: providing all the details. It will be like a
7 RAP for our lead-based paint in soils programs. This is
8 really an important document to the Trust and I know
9 it's really important to DTSC. We are in the process of
10 doing final edits to that right now. And we've got some
11 comments back from the Park Service on that. I'm
12 actually handling the last bit of the edits on that with
13 my project manager, Neil Larsen. And hopefully it will
14 be in better shape this time. We want to get it to the
15 regulators no later than February 7th. On this document
16 there will be a formal public comment period on that
17 plan and be seeking comments later on this year.

18 MS. BLUM: How do you get information out to
19 the public at large that you're having a public comment
20 period on something like that?

21 MR. COOPER: The Trust will prepare a fact
22 sheet called the "Proposed Plan," and we will mail that
23 out, not only to our RAB membership, but to all Presidio
24 residents. We will put an ad in the paper, telling
25 people the proposed plans are at the Trust library. And

39

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 we'll invite people to come to the public meeting. So
2 ads in the paper, mailings --

3 MS. BLUM: Craig, does it actually go to the
4 entire Presidio Trust mailing list?

5 MR. COOPER: We put an ad in the Presidio

Presidio RABjan03.txt

6 Post, yeah. Our mailing list is everyone on our RAB
7 mailing list, around 200 or so; interested parties; and
8 everyone who is a resident of the Presidio gets a copy
9 of the proposed plan. Other people have to find out
10 about it in the ads in the Presidio Post or the
11 Chronicle.

12 MR. BOGGS: If there were sites that were at
13 the edge of Presidio or near the Presidio near
14 residences they must also do a search and notify
15 residences that would possibly be affected in the
16 immediate area.

17 MR. COOPER: To get back to our CERCLA sites,
18 this is one that went through the whole process last
19 year; and we got a final RAP or decision document on
20 that. Then, for the new folks, that document was signed
21 October of 2002. September? Maybe September 2002. And
22 we were all geared up. The designs were ready to go in
23 October to start the cleanup before the rains start.
24 And we accepted bids from contractors to do this work.
25 And in the procurement process we got a bid protest. So

40

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 that caused a good 60- to 90-day delay on that. But we
2 worked out the bid protest, basically denied it. But
3 that took us some time to do that. And we have awarded
4 a final contract to our construction contractor, ERRG. I
5 don't know what that stands for, but that's the name of
6 company that is actually the construction company that
7 is going to be doing the work, the excavation work. And
8 they got right out there after the New Year. And if you
9 drive out there you'll see that all the site-control
10 fencing has gone up. We put up our erosion controls.
11 They've done some test stations to start profiling the
12 waste, because we need to know exactly what landfill we
13 should be sending it to and what waste we're giving
14 them. And we are going to start actually digging by the
15 end of this week, we hope.

16 MR. SUTTER: What's the current contractor's
17 schedule for completion?

18 MR. COOPER: I think, as accepted, six weeks
19 to eight weeks for both landfills, but they're done when
20 they're done.

21 MR. SUTTER: I presume by this time they've
22 submitted a schedule [inaudible]

23 MR. COOPER: George would know, though. I
24 don't know that detail. I think George would have told
25 me if it was completely different than what we put out

41

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 on our bid specs: six to eight weeks. No more than two
2 months for completing the excavation. There might be
3 some soil sampling coming in.

4 George put in some pictures, so that's, I
5 guess, Landfill 4 doing a little bit of test digging for
6 waste profiling purposes. That's at Fill Site 5. And
7 this is the site that Mark is going to be working on as
8 far as setting up the plans for revegetation.

9 Groundwater monitoring is a Presidio-wide
10 program where we test groundwater at both our CERCLA
11 sites and our petroleum sites on a quarterly basis. We
12 just finished our 4th quarter 2002 rounds. It takes a

Presidio RABjan03.txt

13 couple months to get a report out for people to look at.
14 So, going backwards, Q3 is with the Park Service right
15 now under review and Q2 from last year have been
16 released to the agencies. I think we're getting caught
17 up on getting those out.

18 MR. BERMAN: You might mention to the new
19 members just how many sites that is, that has to be
20 monitored. There's a huge number of sites.

21 MR. COOPER: There's a large number of sites.
22 It's over 150 wells, something like that. Each quarter
23 costs us \$250,000 per quarter for the analytical lab
24 costs and report writing, so that groundwater monitoring
25 program alone is costing us about \$1.0 million a year at

42

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 its current level.

2 Other CERCLA projects -- this is the next big
3 decision document that's coming up. It's for basically
4 three landfills. A disturbed area is the same as a
5 landfill. We have two landfills overhanging over the
6 Baker Beach area, then a fill side or landfill called
7 Fill Site 6 on the map at Lincoln and Girard. The Trust
8 is writing a remediation action plan for that. There
9 will be a public comment period and the whole nine yards
10 on that document also. So we need to get that one
11 going, because the construction schedule for these three
12 sites are for the summer/fall of 2003, so the sooner the
13 better on that one. We are doing the design work
14 concurrently with the decision document. So as soon as
15 the decision document is approved by the regulatory
16 agencies and we have public comment, the designs will be
17 ready.

18 Again, the remedies on those sites are going
19 to be excavation and cleanup closure for these two
20 landfills. Fill Site 6 is a partial excavation and soil
21 control.

22 Then the next RAP after that. We've actually
23 assigned a contractor to start work on this one. It's
24 at Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 1 and 2. And there's a
25 whole bunch of other sites that will be in this RAP

43

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 also. And our contractor on this one is Matt Tech
2 [phonetic spelling]. We brought them out to the site
3 late last year. And they're starting to do some
4 preliminary thinking about how to prepare for these
5 sites and how to work out the design, because the design
6 for Baker Beach 1 and 2 is going to be complicated, so
7 they are proposing to do some geophysical surveys at
8 those two sites to get a better handle on the
9 preliminary design. Okay.

10 MR. KERN: You mentioned that there will be a
11 whole bunch of other sites instead of just those two.
12 Five? Ten?

13 MR. COOPER: Oh, I think right now there's
14 about a dozen or so.

15 MR. KERN: Are they all no-action?

16 MR. COOPER: In addition to Baker Beach 1 and
17 2, it's 1351, 1244, 1245, the transfer station. I have
18 got a handle on that. Those are the action sites.
19 There are several no-action sites that are going to be

Presidio RABJan03.txt

tucked into those RAPs also.

MR. KERN: That's an important bit of information for everyone to key in on.

MR. COOPER: How about if I send out an e-mail again where I've grouped sites by RAP and I show my preliminary grouping of the by RAP. Again, that's not

44

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

approved by the regulatory agencies at this point, but it's my recommendation on how to group the sites into a particular RAP.

MR. ULLENSVANG: That might be something to talk about at a committee meeting.

MR. BOGGS: It should be based on the FS results.

MR. BERMAN: In Baker Beach Areas 1 and 2, there is a potential for erosion to occur if the remediation is not planned carefully. Those are serious issues. If you go in there and excavate, those are steep and potentially may have that problem. So in lieu of what happened at Crissy Field, presumably your contractor, Mac Tech, you can tap on the shoulder and tell them to think carefully about the potential for causing some erosion by the remediation process.

MR. COOPER: Right. Definitely. We're going to use temporary erosion control and native plantings coming in for long-term erosion control.

MR. KERN: It's now 8:30. Why don't we take a ten-minute break so everyone can stretch and we give our reporter a break.

[A BREAK WAS TAKEN FROM 8:30 P.M. UNTIL 8:42 P.M.]

MR. NELSON: Good evening, everyone. My name

45

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

is Chris Nelson. I'm a project manager at the Presidio Trust. As Craig has described earlier, there are various programs that we have. I work primarily on the CERCLA projects, the investigation and cleanup of sites. So I'm going to talk very briefly tonight. I only have about five slides to go over some of the projects I'm working on.

The first one is Landfill E. Landfill E is actually known as an installation site. It's within the [inaudible] feasibility study right now. But we have conducted a field investigation of the site this past fall in October and November. And our fieldwork is complete now. And the data has been coming and there's been some preliminary look at it and some interpretation of it.

The development of the field investigation was a collaborative process between the RAB and the Trust and its agencies and the Park Service. One of the comments that was made when the field-sampling plan was being developed for the field work was that possibly the RAB and the agencies and the Trust would get together and coevaluate the data and determine how to interpret it. It was a lot of data collected. And we're finally at the point where we have it and we can propose a date and hope that it's amenable to RAB members, especially

46

Presidio RABjan03.txt
CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 those who can attend, preferably an afternoon meeting on
2 the day of the next RAB meeting, which is February 28th,
3 in the evening. The reason being is we have consultants
4 who would be attending and it would be good if we could
5 possibly convene a few hours before the RAB meeting and
6 just carry that into the meeting. They can ask
7 questions or get an update on the data presentation.

8 MR. KERN: Does that seem reasonable for
9 people?

10 MR. NELSON: It will be at Building 1750. I
11 can send out an e-mail to everybody. There's going to
12 be quite a few posting maps showing the data; some
13 cross-sections that have been drawn; a look at some of
14 the borings data tables. So it should be a good
15 meeting.

16 And shortly after that, we will be able to get
17 a report together for the Park Service's review next
18 month. And then once the Trust and Park Service concur
19 on the report, we can get that to the agencies and get
20 it out. If we can get some interpretation and comments
21 and some additional discussion before the report comes
22 out, there won't be a lot of surprises to what it's
23 going to say. It will possibly streamline the review of
24 the report a little bit more.

25 Bob, do you want Ron to come to that meeting?

47

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 I think his time is real tight.

2 MR. BOGGS: I'll send him an e-mail and find
3 out his availability.

4 MR. KERN: Chris, do you have any early
5 indications on the lab results? Anything? Any
6 hazardous waste?

7 MR. NELSON: Yeah. There were some areas
8 where there were quite high levels of lead in the soil.
9 They weren't necessarily where we predicted that they'd
10 be. We aren't seeing halo effects on the firing range.
11 One of the objectives of the investigation was to
12 evaluate the waste-characteristic data and the estimates
13 that have been put forth in the past about the
14 percentages of nonhazardous, California-hazardous, and
15 [inaudible]-hazardous waste were appropriate based on
16 the sampling that was done. I think you're going to see
17 an increase on the amount of Cal-haz, and [inaudible]
18 hazardous waste from this. There were some test kits
19 where they did some STLC and PCLD tracking and did
20 verify some [inaudible]. That wasn't widespread. There
21 were only a couple of different areas.

22 MR. BERMAN: What about the boundaries? Any
23 new information on that?

24 MR. NELSON: For the most part it was a little
25 bit of an adjustment to the boundary but not a lot. We

48

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 can take a look at that and see if you agree with the
2 assessment. We really added quite a bit of data, quite
3 a few data points. We have really been able to answer
4 some questions about the potential metric surface, which
5 is the way the groundwater flows, in which direction,

Presidio RABjan03.txt

6 where it's coming from, where it's going, what depth it
7 exists at.

8 MR. BERMAN: What about the geological model.
9 Has that supported the original process that was
10 presented by EKI? Is that supported by the data?

11 MR. NELSON: The RE site-conceptual model is
12 going to be updated based on the fact that we have a lot
13 more borings and test kits and upgrading information and
14 cross-grading information. It looks a lot different,
15 from what I've seen.

16 MR. BERMAN: Is there going to be information
17 as to the potential separation between the bottom of the
18 fill and where the groundwater begins?

19 MR. NELSON: Yep. To the extent that we have
20 that information based on a few monitor events, one
21 water-quality monitoring event and a few looks at the
22 water levels.

23 MR. PONTON: With these rains, were you able
24 to sample the height?

25 MR. NELSON: I know that the sampling event

49

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 that was last done occurred in December. I don't know
2 if they sampled for seep or not, but I know that
3 Treadwell is scheduled to go back and do additional
4 groundwater sampling in February for next quarter of
5 2003, but if necessary we can get out there and sample.
6 I know it was squalling the week of New Year's.

7 MR. PONTON: I think we could establish the
8 commitment that we would have that pipe sampled.

9 MR. NELSON: It was the last time I saw it.
10 What Jim is talking about is the Army
11 installed a pipe through the landfill. Whether it
12 predates the landfill or was there after the landfill
13 was occurring, you walk up to the southern edge of
14 landfill you'll see what the berm at the head of
15 landfill were the steep slope comes down and if you look
16 around there's a depression and you can see a clear
17 storm drain grate. Water ponds there in the wintertime
18 that eventually drains into that grate and there's a
19 pipe that daylights at the toe of the landfill a couple
20 hundred feet away. That's where the water comes out.
21 So it's a unique way of managing storm water.

22 Once the Trust and Park Service have reviewed
23 the report we'll get that to the agency and the RAB for
24 review.

25 One of the other projects that saw some

50

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 activity late last year was the Public Health Service
2 landfills. The Trust is conducting a five-year review
3 of the Public Health Service Hospital. Rod rendered a
4 decision which includes two landfills -- Landfills 8 and
5 10. We conducted fieldwork on those sites in November
6 of 2002. The fieldwork been complete for a while and
7 URS, the consultant, is currently writing the report.
8 We intend to meet with them at the end of January to
9 discuss some of the preliminary findings. What was
10 found was soil samples at Landfill 8 and a lot of
11 geotechnical and seismic samples as well as water
12 samples collected there and some test kits to get a

Presidio RABjan03.txt

13 better feeling for what's in the landfill. So once we
14 got a look at the report and the Park Service and the
15 Trust can concur on this, we'll release it to the
16 agencies, probably in the first quarter of this year.
17 The feasibility study, which I mentioned
18 earlier, was connected to Landfill E is probably 35
19 sites that are undergoing one of the final steps of the
20 assessment before a decision is made about how to clean
21 up the site in the CERCLA process. The Trust and the
22 Park Service received a draft of the feasibility study
23 for review last year. We've taken a look at it and we
24 intend to meet in the next couple of weeks to talk about
25 our comments. And we're hoping to get that document out

51

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 to the agencies and the RAB early this year. We'll keep
2 you updated on that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did you mention what
4 the preliminary findings were for Landfills 8 and 10?

5 MR. NELSON: I didn't. We haven't had a
6 chance to look at them yet. Sorry.

7 Couple months ago I walked people through the
8 work plan for the five-year review and talked about the
9 specific sampling strategies for that site. And I'd be
10 glad to talk about those at a RAB committee meeting.
11 They are a better forum; a bit more informal; doesn't
12 put the onus on the court reporter to keep up with
13 chemical names and the like; and there's a little bit
14 more back-and-forth discussion about that. We should
15 look at doing that if people are up to that.

16 More CERCLA projects that are currently
17 ongoing: Small-arm firing ranges, of which there are
18 five -- we've talked about this the last couple of
19 meetings. The Trust is going to be conducting a
20 feasibility study of five ranges. The corresponding
21 progress draft work plan is being completed. And we're
22 going give the Park Service the next one for their
23 review. After that the work plan will be sent off to
24 the agencies and the RAB for review. And if it's
25 desired by the and/or the agencies, I'd be glad to

52

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 provide an overview of the firing ranges program, where
2 it stands right now, which of the sites we're going to
3 be looking at, and what the general strategy is for
4 evaluating them and getting them cleaned up. So let me
5 know if that's something of interest.

6 MR. COOPER: A general overview would be
7 provided before the work plan goes to the agencies but
8 that will be very general. And after the work plan we
9 could provide a much more detailed description of our
10 strategy.

11 MR. NELSON: The last thing that we worked on
12 is the remedial design for Mountain Lake, which we're
13 putting out a little bit ahead of the remedial action
14 plan, but we've got a general idea of what needs to be
15 done. There's a lot of preliminary work that needs to
16 be completed to figure out how to best implement the
17 remedy. So this work continues in the background. And
18 our consultant, the URS Corporation, is compiling a list
19 of data caps that will help us address some of the

Presidio RABjan03.txt

20 unusual phases of the new design. We will probably be
21 talking to the agencies about that pretty soon to
22 discuss the particulars.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does it talk about
24 dredging down to 30 feet like it was originally used to
25 dump? They dumped a lot of that stuff in there -- the
53

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 concrete and rocks and stuff in there.

2 MR. NELSON: There was some material that was
3 dumped in the lake when they built Park Presidio
4 Boulevard and the tunnel there.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's apparently some
6 sort of gas, isn't there?

7 MR. NELSON: There's a high level of lead,
8 probably from gasoline and other sources from
9 automobiles that have leached out and leaked into storm
10 drains there. And the proposed plan at this time is to
11 dredge the lake, not to 30 feet, but probably closer to
12 15, I think.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: I don't think it's even that
14 deep, maybe 12.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that just
16 temporarily, or is it until it's back to its original
17 depth?

18 MR. NELSON: The lake is actually smaller than
19 it was when it was 30 feet deep, so if you dig it to 30
20 feet deep, it's going to be a big pit and wouldn't be
21 stable.

22 MR. BERMAN: Is your plan going to consider
23 the rerouting of the storm drains?

24 MR. NELSON: Yeah. That's something we are
25 looking at. We definitely have to address that issue
54

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 because it's something that we're looking at. We still
2 need to address the issue of other contaminants getting
3 into the lake, so that's something we're working on as
4 well.

5 MR. BERMAN: Will the cost of that be part of
6 the Trust's responsibility, or is Caltrans going to pay
7 for the rerouting of the drains?

8 MR. NELSON: It's something we are looking at
9 right now. It would depend on where the storm drains
10 are and where the storm water will go. We need to
11 consult with Caltrans and the City. If the water were
12 to go to the City's storm drains, it would be going to
13 the untreated works and that wouldn't be acceptable to
14 the City of San Francisco. So there's lots of moving
15 parts to that issue, but we are trying to get our arms
16 around all of that at the same time.

17 MR. BERMAN: But that will all be part of your
18 plan?

19 MR. NELSON: Yes, but as for who is going to
20 pay for that remains to be seen right now. That will
21 definitely be part of what we're doing out there.

22 That's all I have for tonight. Are there any
23 questions on any of that?

24 MR. BERMAN: When do you expect the plan to be
25 ready?
55

Presidio_RABjan03.txt
CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. NELSON: Mountain Lake? It's in a
2 preliminary phase right now. I don't recall exactly
3 when our initial design is going to be done, but
4 sometime later this year we'll have -- the first memo is
5 basically a memo that you asked us to put together and
6 identify data gaps. And we'll be sharing that with
7 people to address some of the concerns that the design
8 is going to have to look at. I'm fairly confident we'll
9 have the draft design done this calendar year. But I
10 think the remediation schedule for that site is likely
11 to be toward the end of period, 2007. So we've got some
12 time. The RAP process will catch up with the design as
13 we move forward and get the FS done.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there also a plan to
15 shore up the lake and put it near toward going back to
16 the bridge?

17 MR. NELSON: Did you say shoring up?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, shoring up or
19 retaining wall or something?

20 MR. NELSON: When we do the design for the
21 excavation of the sediment, that's where the slope
22 stability issue will be taken into account so there
23 isn't some failure of the roadway.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MR. KERN: I can save this for later, but I

56

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 think there were a number of items that you touched on
2 that if we did plan some kinds of overviews, the RAB
3 could be more involved in your thinking of the strategy
4 and offer our comments at an earlier time in the
5 process. So I really look forward to the scheduling of
6 the firing range issues. I think if I were to ask the
7 community members right now, "Can you even name the
8 firing ranges," I think many of us would have trouble.
9 We could start at that and look at how contaminated are
10 they; when are they going to come up in the schedule;
11 how will we mix those with the other CERCLA sites?

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: One other thing. [inaudible]
13 will be the first remedial investigation of that the
14 Trust has done. And many, if not most of the RAB
15 members, have never gone through the RI process. That's
16 a whole new set of expectations and elements of what is
17 embodied in that.

18 MR. BERMAN: That's what Doug just brought up.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think the use of that
20 process will be deserving of a different discussion.

21 MR. COOPER: Is this one for the March
22 committee meeting? Even if the work plan isn't quite
23 ready to be sent in to that agency, we can still provide
24 some information. Like you said, where are they, what's
25 their history? We can start setting the stage.

57

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: We can do ten minutes at this
2 meeting and list the sites and describe what the
3 objectives of a generic RI are and decide where it goes.
4 We can do it in February or we can do it right now.

5 MR. NELSON: We kind of addressed the issues

Presidio RABjan03.txt

6 related to one of the sites. It's the Barnard Avenue
7 protected range. It's the site that was formerly where
8 Landfill E is right now. So that's in sort of the East
9 Housing area just west of the Main Post. That was quite
10 a long range, probably one of the longer ones.

11 Where Building 215 is is basically the central
12 part of the Main Post, which used to be the Spanish post
13 and then later the American military Presidio, was the
14 main focus of the base. The Officers Club, which is
15 where we are, is the large building due south of
16 Building 215, where the buildings sort of stop. That's
17 us, right there. If you just go down to the right,
18 there's Barnard Avenue Protected Range in that purple
19 stripe.

20 MR. COOPER: There's five?

21 MR. NELSON: Five. A couple of them are
22 really close together. The Lower Creek Protected Range
23 and the Lower Creek Target Boxes are on the extreme
24 southwest corner of the Presidio. One of them actually
25 predated some of those buildings down there. Another

58

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 one is over there across where Lincoln Boulevard is now:
2 That's three. The fourth one is a very small one near
3 where Building 637 used to be. It's to the south of the
4 commissary area, just over there. The machine gun butts
5 out of Building 637. Basically, if you were to walk up
6 the hill, you'd be on Doyle Drive. It's the base of
7 that hill right there. It's east of the Pet Cemetery.

8 The last one, if you notice when you're
9 traveling on Lincoln Boulevard to the Bridge and go
10 across, you'll see a sign that says "Battery East."
11 That one of the oldest batteries out here. It's made of
12 brick. On the far western side of that, there used to
13 be a California Highway Patrol pistol range, and they
14 shot into the berm soil. They literally were shooting
15 in the soil berm that overlaid the East Battery there.

16 That's east of the bridge, north of the
17 pedestrian path there. That was confounded by the
18 presence of the Caltrans brickyard because there's some
19 lead contamination from the paint there. There's some
20 surrounding contamination that was quite higher than any
21 other firing range. So the idea was to try and
22 eliminate that.

23 In a nutshell, the main goal will be to
24 further characterize those sites as best we can in the
25 CERCLA as to the nature and extent of contamination and

59

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 the risk posed by the remaining contamination. So we'll
2 make recommendations for a feasibility study and for the
3 remedies.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does the skeet range
5 qualify as any kind of --

6 MR. NELSON: The skeet range was the one that
7 Craig was talking about earlier. That was one of the
8 ones that was remediated earlier by the Army and then
9 later by the Trust. The Army still retains
10 responsibility for those, the part that's buried by the
11 Bay and the sediments there below a certain tideline,
12 actually, but we're still responsible for investigating

13 for cleaning that up.
14 MS. TRIGIANI: Is that recreational?
15 MR. NELSON: Yes.
16 There's one firing range that's not at Crissy
17 Field. It's kind of at Crissy Field, but it's not in
18 the program. It's the legacy of the Army and how they
19 did things. The Building 633 firing range, that is
20 actually being addressed in the main installation
21 feasibility study. That will not be in the RFS. It's
22 further along in the process, so the Army offered to
23 keep it in the installation. The main reason that the
24 firing range sites aren't in the main installation is
25 that they lag behind in terms of investigation.

60

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. BOGGS: Has there been any consideration
2 that, where the mustard gas vials were found, articles
3 tend to indicate there was live machine-gun fire while
4 people were crawling through the trenches. It doesn't
5 appear to be included in the firing ranges. I'm not
6 sure if that would be included in the Army's assessment
7 and/or as a retained condition or not.
8 MR. COOPER: I'm trying to remember that
9 article. It definitely talked about how they were
10 [inaudible] 15 inches above ground. People had to crawl
11 through trenches.
12 MR. BERMAN: If you find any unexploded
13 ordnance in any of these firing ranges, is that a
14 possibility?
15 MR. NELSON: A lot of projectiles were
16 actually removed by the Army when they did their
17 sampling in '96.
18 MR. BERMAN: Then, it is theoretically
19 possible that there could be unexploded ordnance?
20 MR. NELSON: Yeah.
21 MR. BERMAN: So is that the Army's
22 responsibility?
23 MR. NELSON: Yes.
24 MR. BOGGS: The small arms isn't unexploded
25 ordnance, which is where there are things that would

61

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 fall. An unexploded ordnance is something that is shot;
2 and when it hits, it explodes. There wasn't much of a
3 record of those being used here.
4 MR. COOPER: Your concern is if the archives
5 search says it looks like there was a firing range of
6 some type at Inspiration Point, then who's going to do
7 that work? If it doesn't count as ordnance, there's
8 another avenue. The Army can open these as "unknown
9 contamination." And we can try to open that up as a way
10 that the Army could pay for it.
11 MR. NELSON: That site would probably have to
12 fall within the first step in the CERCLA process, or the
13 preliminary assessment, seeing as there were no maps
14 identifying the size of it. We were able to find very
15 old maps and drawings of the Barnard protective range
16 that go way back to maps at the Presidio and just look
17 at the whole Tennessee Hollow area. I don't believe
18 it's anything that's in the current Army MOA as far as
19 [inaudible]

Presidio RABJan03.txt

20 MR. COOPER: If it does turn out to be a
21 firing range there, there wouldn't be enough time to
22 incorporate it into this work plan that we're working on
23 right now. It would lag behind by a certain period of
24 time.

25 MR. NELSON: But the Barnard area, as you've

62

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 just described it, is actually overlapping where
2 existing housing is now. If you were to walk directly
3 east of Building 42, down that hill, you would be about
4 where the firing line is. There are some houses there,
5 but I don't believe there's houses that have been built
6 directly on the range parts, pretty close to it, though.

7 MR. BERMAN: But you would assess that as far
8 as the plan?

9 MR. NELSON: Yes.

10 MS. TRIGIANI: Didn't George indicate that
11 they did a thorough search of the homes in the immediate
12 area right around them before they started renting them
13 out to the public? I remember asking that question when
14 I first came on the RAB.

15 MR. NELSON: I'm sure that was done.

16 MS. TRIGIANI: George indicated that they did
17 a pretty thorough --

18 MR. NELSON: [inaudible]

19 MS. TRIGIANI: You mean it would predate the
20 house?

21 MR. NELSON: Predating the housing, maybe in
22 1912 or 1913. And the houses on Fernandez Street and
23 Quarry Road were built in the '50s.

24 MS. TRIGIANI: So we'll have a sense of how
25 long ago these ranges were used.

63

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. NELSON: We know fairly accurately when
2 those ranges were used. This is, like, up to and
3 through World War II but probably not after that. My
4 guess would be, if there had been an extensive range
5 there and there's a lot of stuff from the restoration,
6 then projectiles would have been uncovered. But they
7 could also be buried. It can be a very specific area
8 where they were firing. And they could be all buried.

9 MR. BOGGS: This could explain the high levels
10 of lead there, too.

11 MR. NELSON: So this is a whole new avenue
12 we're walking down here. Kind of exciting for some of
13 you old-time RAB members, for sure.

14 MR. BOGGS: Would this be done before the
15 archive search is actually complete, because that should
16 shed some light on whether these were just rifles and
17 small arms, or whether their search will include
18 explosive ordnance? So, if any of these ranges were
19 used for explosive ordnance, presumably, it will come
20 out in the archive search.

21 MR. NELSON: Are you talking about the known
22 range or the unknown range?

23 MR. BOGGS: In the known ranges, if they were
24 ever used for explosive ordnance firing. The archive
25 search should shed some light on that.

64

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think one of the keys is
2 how well the Army [inaudible] then it will [inaudible].
3 Knowing what will be in the firing range RFS, the
4 archive report will be just adding to. It wouldn't take
5 away anything in there.

6 MR. KERN: I guess, to kind of circle back to
7 where it started on the firing range, that's just one
8 item that you mentioned. There were a lot of these
9 things. And I think it would be really important to get
10 the RAB involved. We have been for a long time, for
11 example, on the Landfill E findings for a while. I
12 think we should reserve this -- perhaps all this
13 discussion and where the schedule is -- for the next
14 committee meeting so we don't take up everyone's time
15 now.

16 I might put in people's ear the idea that we
17 could use a regular RAB meeting to go over a topic like
18 that. I don't want to shy away from findings and data
19 at these meetings. Where most of the RAB members
20 actually make it to these meetings, it's really
21 important that occasionally we're all immersed in that
22 kind of information. That's the starting basis of how
23 decisions are made. It comes back to clean-up levels.
24 It's all based on that data and quality control. And we
25 could spend a whole meeting, I'm sure. And people would

65

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 have lots of tangential questions, but we could start
2 storing up those questions, maybe not answer them all
3 that night. But I really think now that, over the last
4 several months, you have collected a lot of data and
5 investigated a lot of sites; and we are about to enter a
6 phase of what to do with that. So I think it might be
7 worth trying to get us really involved in that, just
8 trying to understand it as much as possible. So we have
9 a Landfill E meeting coming up. And, as I understand
10 it, there will be a lot of data to review here. So I
11 agree that maybe it would be a good idea to have a
12 premeeting to review it. But I have a whole list of
13 things that I think we will put into a package of trying
14 to decide how to schedule and review all that at our
15 next meeting.

16 MR. NELSON: We are happy to present data --
17 not to gloss over it -- but in a more sort of cursory
18 fashion, as I've done in the past. It's totally up to
19 you when you want to hear it. If something is extensive
20 enough to require two meetings, we can do that.

21 MR. COOPER: I absolutely agree. If you take
22 a look at the agendas for our last several RAB meetings,
23 it's always been site updates. And you can only talk so
24 much about each site, 'cause there's so many sites; so
25 you never really get beneath the skin, so to speak,

66

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 about a site. So we're always updating the agenda
2 items. If you want to dive in and go deeper on any of
3 these, just tell us you which ones. We will be happy to
4 do that.

5 MR. KERN: I think several weeks or months ago

Presidio RABJan03.txt

6 we had been talking about a RAB strategy for Mountain
7 Lake. And we need to stay coordinated with you guys
8 about where all those processes are, between the design
9 work and Caltrans and where we might do our thing in the
10 public realm as far as motivating that process. So in
11 your report there were a lot of hot-button issues that
12 came up that deserve a lot of attention. So thanks for
13 bringing all those up.

14 Any other comments on Chris's stuff? Thanks,
15 Chris.

16 Let's move to Item 6.

17 MR. BOGGS: I'll just do a brief update, kind
18 of following their project status outline. There were
19 some things regarding Crissy Field brought up. Fill
20 Site 7 has been under review. I had a management
21 meeting yesterday. My supervisor has been out for an
22 extended period of time over Christmas and has been very
23 ill, and yesterday was his first day back. There's
24 still a few concerns at Fill Site 7 that they would like
25 to see some very limited sampling. There's one tiny

67

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 pesticide which does not affect people very much, but it
2 does affect birds. In fact, you have to eat about a
3 pound of dirt to get what's in a single zinc lozenge.
4 So our agency is going to be looking for a very focused,
5 very minor analysis of sampling where we had a minor
6 defect. There's also some follow-up going on regarding
7 some pesticides east of Mason.

8 Basically, we are at the point where we're
9 ready to certify construction completion for most of
10 Crissy Field. What is sitting on the table now is
11 land-use controls, which is just some sort of plan so
12 that anywhere where contamination remains, there's a
13 control in place so people or critters or plants don't
14 get exposed to it. I think that's the only place we
15 have some issues with what's going on here and what was
16 presented. We are deeply involved in all of these other
17 tasks.

18 Mountain Lake: I've been becoming a legal
19 assistant and doing some legal research for that.
20 There's new areas that I'm finding out I'm not a good
21 lawyer, so we're still moving forward, but slowly.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Has there been some fun
23 and games with Caltrans?

24 MR. BOGGS: They haven't been playing much
25 Ping-Pong yet. There's been a few discussions that have

68

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 gone on. But basically DTSB is trying to get together a
2 comprehensive letter that gives them the one-two punch
3 to at least come to the table. They've pretty much
4 turned their nose up at us at this point regarding
5 several of the issues. There is more than one issue
6 involved here. One has to do with the existing storm
7 drains and the need for rerouting those in the future.

8 The second has to do with the contamination
9 that consists within the lake and their responsibility
10 or lack of for that.

11 The next path that I'm going down has to do
12 with special species habitat and whether the Endangered

13 Species Act will help support our legal argument as
14 well.

15 Any questions?

16 MS. CHEEVER: The pesticide that you
17 mentioned, is that Roundup or something a lot stronger?
18 Who's using pesticides?

19 MR. BOGGS: It was a former Army area called
20 "East of Mason," where they had DDT and chlorodane. The
21 DDT apparently was all cleaned up. There's potentially
22 some chlorodane that needs to be followed up on.

23 MR. BERMAN: On the Mountain Lake issue, I'll
24 talk to you privately about that.

25 MR. KERN: Any other comments for Bob?

69

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Jim? Anything?

2 I think that I've received a few more of your
3 very detailed comment letters. So thanks for keeping
4 those coming.

5 MR. KERN: We're onto new business. On this
6 category, I want to mention a little bit about the
7 ongoing financial information discussion that we're
8 having with the Trust with Craig and his colleagues. I
9 think at one point that it was announced that I would be
10 able to get in and review the documents and get some
11 things moving along. And we're talking specifically
12 about past financial information, and not information
13 that is going in currently into the Trust's accounting
14 system.

15 And there's a couple of -- we're breaking the
16 financial information, I guess, into two categories. I
17 continue to work with Craig; and I have a meeting set
18 up. We are trying to deal with some issues around
19 confidential business information, so the Trust is
20 not -- I don't want to put them in a position where they
21 have to review every single document and do a whole
22 bunch of redaction. That wasn't really the point. So
23 we're trying to do something in between. We have a
24 meeting scheduled. I'm not saying a lot about it,
25 because we are just trying to work informally without

70

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 trying to produce a lot of paperwork.

2 Also, at the same time, I know there have been
3 comments from a number of RAB members. And I'd like to
4 give those folks any opportunity they want now, at this
5 point in the meeting, maybe to make a comment around
6 that. I know, David, you've had some ongoing work that
7 you've been doing and interest in the subjects. I'm not
8 putting you on the spot, either. So if there are things
9 that we should talk about after or schedule other
10 meetings, I did want to let people know I'm continuing
11 to try to work on this particular issue.

12 Also, I would note that recently I've received
13 an updated schedule from the Trust for the whole
14 remediation schedule. It was also part of what you had
15 to present to Bob. So I have not had a chance to review
16 that in detail but, given all of the data that we've had
17 tonight, that's something that I would like to, at one
18 of our committee meetings, have a chance to take a lot
19 of these updates that are being reported on and spread

20 out the schedule and try to match things to the schedule
21 so people could integrate those things for themselves
22 and see that all matches. I think having the brain
23 power and expertise of the RAB, just making general
24 comments on the schedule, from what you hear, would be
25 valuable. And that's one of our principal roles, to

71

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 provide that kind of feedback. So that's another thing
2 that I'd like to schedule in some of our future
3 meetings. Any thoughts at this point on the schedule
4 and financial information?

5 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. I made my concerns known
6 to the community members. At this point, I think I
7 would like to request that the community members, in
8 some way, get together and review the entire situation,
9 whether it's perhaps after the next committee meeting or
10 at some other date. I think that would be a more
11 effective way of sounding out what the community
12 members' concerns are, in addition to mine or contrary
13 to mine or whatever, and coming up with some kind of
14 consensus how the group of community members would want
15 to move forward on those issues.

16 MR. KERN: Very good.

17 MS. MONAGHAN: I think we should be talking
18 about financing and schedule at every committee meeting
19 on the second Thursday, even if it's 15 minutes, where
20 we take the schedule out, look at it, and say, "Are we
21 thinking about and doing the things that we need in
22 order to be ready for next year's work?" And are we
23 holding the process up by asking too many questions or
24 getting in the way of things? That's kind of my
25 perspective.

72

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 I've already said my issues about the
2 finances. How are we going to push this out? That's
3 why I'm interested on what the landfills are that we're
4 digging up right now. How will we adjust the budget?
5 That's what I'm interested in.

6 MS. BLUM: That mirrors my thought process.
7 And I know that extrapolations and projections are
8 always very difficult, but I am concerned that we will
9 get to the end of the road and will have long since run
10 out of money when we need it. So maybe we can talk
11 about how do we preserve the funds that -- we really
12 don't know what we need, because we haven't gotten that
13 far -- but how do we prepare for the end of the cleanup
14 time and still have enough money to do it.

15 MR. KERN: Other thoughts or comments?

16 MR. COOPER: On the schedule, I just wanted to
17 make sure we have an overview bar chart for all of our
18 remediation projects as far as fill programs and
19 construction for each of our remediation sites, how they
20 lay out, when they're happening. Does everyone have
21 a -- I know the new RAB members haven't gotten this yet,
22 but I'll make sure you get a copy of it.

23 MR. BOGGS: It may be out of date already, and
24 your meeting tomorrow may potentially produce some
25 changes in the schedule. Do you want to wait until

73

Presidio RABjan03.txt
CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 after tomorrow's meeting?
2 MR. COOPER: After tomorrow's meeting.
3 MS. MONAGHAN: I would be happy to get a new
4 schedule at the committee meeting.
5 MR. COOPER: Let's go with that one.
6 MS. MONAGHAN: The overview is fine.
7 MR. KERN: Anything else under "New Business"?
8 MR. BOGGS: I was just going to give my phone
9 number to the new RAB members if they have any questions
10 regarding the regulatory process: (510) 540-3751. Also,
11 my e-mail is boggs@DTSC.ca.gov.
12 MR. KERN: Any other questions?
13 MR. BERMAN: I don't know -- a couple of
14 committee meetings ago, I had been asking for a copy of
15 remediation programs insurance policy. And Mr. Youngkin
16 was kind enough to give me these two packets. And first
17 I thought, My God, this is going to be difficult to wade
18 through, but it took me 10 minutes to wade through it,
19 because just about every page of the damned thing is
20 blacked out. All the significant information is blacked
21 out. So I can't understand what the terms or
22 conditions, what the coverage is, the limits, et cetera.
23 I'd like to ask that the RAB make a full request to the
24 Trust to provide us with a full, detailed, current copy
25 of the insurance policy.

74

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Now, this may touch upon the confidentiality
2 of business or financial information, but this, to me,
3 provided the information to the RAB is upfront, I think
4 we should go on record as not accepting and receiving
5 non-information.
6 MR. KERN: Very good. I've got it down as an
7 action.
8 MR. BERMAN: Perhaps you might explain to the
9 new members the committee meeting's structure, the
10 schedule, and the location.
11 MR. KERN: Good point. The monthly committee
12 meetings are held at a different building than this
13 one -- Building 1750. We usually sit around a table;
14 and it's sort of more informal than this kind of
15 discussion. It's held on the fourth Tuesday at 7:00
16 o'clock.
17 If people will bear with me, is there any
18 other new business?
19 MS. BLUM: Announcement. I would like to
20 remind everyone here that the scoping process for
21 Tennessee Hollow is going on right now and, as part of
22 the public, your opportunity to make your comments on
23 how you see that unique 270-acre watershed being
24 restored to something. It is a fresh-water riparian
25 area, and it's very crucial to the success of Crissy

75

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Field. Eventually, the watershed all drains into Crissy
2 Field. So the scoping process will be closed on the
3 public commentary period January 24th. And, if you
4 would like to be part of that process, you can get a
5 scoping document. They have key questions and maps and

Presidio RABJan03.txt

6 so on. And you can get them from the Trust, Building
7 34. Or you can go on to the Presidio Trust website and
8 get more information on it. But it's really important
9 that the public participate in that because it's a
10 unique opportunity to make a big difference. Thank you.

11 MR. KERN: Any other announcements? New
12 business? Okay.

13 I'm going to try to review these action items.
14 Some of them will be action items. Some of them will be
15 future agenda items. They are all kind of mixed
16 together.

17 A site tour and coordination package for new
18 members. As we were going along, I also noted that,
19 when we went by the groundwater sampling results, or the
20 groundwater sampling report, what is really happening is
21 that, I think, given the level of expenditure, which is
22 about a million a year, we may need to get into some
23 kind of highlights report from the RAB to say here are
24 some interesting sites. Of the 150 wells, we had three
25 that had some anomalous readings or whatever. And I

76

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 would be happy to participate in reviewing the document
2 and working with you to generate that kind of highlights
3 presentation.

4 I have noted down here the grouping of the
5 next RAP -- Baker Beach Disturbed Area 1, 2, and the
6 many others -- some kind of discussion about what's
7 happened with that and what the other sites are. We
8 have talked about getting Landfill 8 and 10 findings
9 into a meeting, whether it's a RAB meeting or a
10 committee meeting. We've got scheduled a Landfill E
11 data meeting on January 28th.

12 I think, Jim, you mentioned you were
13 interested in seeing whether the pipe outflow from
14 Landfill E was tested. That's an item to follow up on.
15 We have the firing range overview to schedule. We have
16 the Mountain Lake, a review of that whole topic area, to
17 schedule and perhaps look at RAB involvement in some
18 future Mountain Lake effort. I would like to -- I think
19 that this is something that we mentioned before -- is
20 having an actual nice-sized remediation map at these
21 meetings that we could point to. This one has a couple
22 of sites -- Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. Maybe just
23 having it always on the projector available as an
24 individual PowerPoint presentation would be a really
25 good idea.

77

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 I did want to note that Sam's request for
2 posted correspondence and reports -- there seems to be
3 some progress in that. That's good. I appreciate that.
4 It appears there was some discussion around the
5 Inspiration Point perhaps being a new firing range site.
6 That may come out of an archive search. It was
7 mentioned a couple of times that there was a quarterly
8 meeting.

9 You may not know what the quarterly meeting
10 means. There are many meetings that occur during the
11 day; and some of them are meetings that we've been
12 invited to. The quarterly meeting has been structured

Presidio RABJan03.txt

13 to really look at the schedule of remediation efforts.
14 I can't actually make tomorrow's meeting, but it is one
15 that RAB members have been invited to previously. So
16 that will be at Building 1750 at 10:00 o'clock tomorrow.
17 All right. Going onwards. It's a big list.
18 Financial information review. That's ongoing in a
19 couple of ways. I mentioned that I'm working with
20 Craig. And it's been requested that we perhaps get a
21 separate meeting together of RAB community members to
22 hash out where we think that issue needs to go. I've
23 got that noted. It was requested that eventually the
24 finances in the schedule be part of every meeting, at
25 perhaps 15 minutes or some amount of time.

78

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: Every committee meeting?
2 MR. KERN: Every committee meeting.
3 And I think, finally, it was the last bit of
4 information that we put on an agenda item that was
5 requested by one of our members that we look at having a
6 formal response for the insurance policy being sort of
7 incomplete information. We might get a more complete
8 understanding of what is in that policy.
9 Anything else I may have not noticed that
10 somebody else might note?
11 MS. CHEEVER: I think you said the Landfill E
12 data meeting was February 28th, but it's January 28th.
13 MR. KERN: It's January 28th.
14 MR. COOPER: Who's going to be the keeper of
15 action items so we can monitor who is doing what?
16 MR. KERN: There's a huge number here, for
17 some reason. I don't usually get this number. I kind
18 of need to process it, too, so I can work with Mark to
19 see which are agenda and which are action items. And we
20 can send out an e-mail to everybody. Hopefully, that
21 will be obvious, who needs to do what. But they are not
22 immediately obvious.
23 MR. BERMAN: Is there any reason that the
24 insurance policy is not a public document?
25 MR. COOPER: I don't know why it's one of the

79

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 many things. I don't know why that was redacted. I
2 will check with my attorney to see why he redacted it in
3 that way. But my recommendation is go ahead and send in
4 a letter and use the Freedom of Information Act. You
5 might as well start from the beginning.
6 MR. BERMAN: But that's a very provocative
7 process.
8 MR. COOPER: I wouldn't say so. That's your
9 right as a citizen.
10 MR. BERMAN: I have seen that happen. As soon
11 as you do that, your letter goes to a lawyer
12 immediately. It seems to me that there must be
13 information within the Trust that you can just get at
14 right away. Is the document a public document or not?
15 MR. COOPER: I'll find that out before you
16 guys start on the letter. You're asking for one
17 document. I think this is a perfect example. And you
18 know the document exists. So I think it would be a very
19 good application of the Freedom of Information Act.

Presidio RABJan03.txt

20 MR. NELSON: I have some input on this. A
21 couple of years ago, we had a bimonthly meeting where
22 the insurance policy and information was actually
23 generally shared with the RAB and the agencies. I don't
24 know how much of that was redacted versus what's not
25 redacted. It was the nuts and bolts of the insurance

80

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 policy and things like that. Now, we can look into
2 presenting that information again, if it's helpful.

3 MR. BERMAN: I'll ask Brian, Do you have a
4 copy of the full insurance policy?

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I probably do in our files;
6 and I'm sure our attorney does.

7 MR. BERMAN: Your attorney, of course. An
8 attorney would have to review the documents. But do
9 you, as a Park Service employee, do you have the
10 document?

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: I can't be certain that I did
12 or not. I expect that I did and it would be in our
13 files.

14 MR. BERMAN: As soon as the Park Service has
15 it -- if the Trust has it and the Park Service has it,
16 then --

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe we have some rights
18 and responsibilities under that policy, so I don't
19 recall exactly how we are into it, which makes it so it
20 could have certain confidentiality claims where we would
21 be able to see it.

22 MR. KERN: I recall that the meeting -- it
23 happened a couple of times, so we'll incorporate that
24 information in this request.

25 MR. BOGGS: In the past, I had someone go

81

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 through such a request. And my understanding is that a
2 request for a specific document will kind of put it to
3 rest real quick. Whether or not the attorneys will say,
4 no, and this is the reason why or you'll get a copy of
5 it, rather than batting it back and forth on who has
6 what just go ahead with it. We get a lot of those
7 requests nowadays. They don't go through the attorney
8 if we have something in our files.

9 Now, if there's something that's really in
10 question, we would go talk to the attorney. But 90
11 percent of [inaudible]

12 MR. NELSON: There's a person at the Presidio
13 Trust by the name of Steve Karp. He's our FOIA officer.
14 He's a legal assistant. He's not actually an attorney,
15 but you're in the right neighborhood.

16 MR. BERMAN: Preliminary to writing a letter,
17 Craig has indicated that he would just look into it. If
18 he comes back at the next committee meeting and says
19 that, indeed, it's a public document, then the necessity
20 of formulating a letter is not initiated.

21 MS. TRIGIANI: As a newer member in this, I
22 kind of step back from all this. To me, this leads to
23 the question of, irrelevant of what's public or not,
24 it's what's the role of the RAB and counselling the
25 questioning Socratically in a positive way, the

82

Presidio RABjan03.txt
CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 activities of the Trust and of the group charged with
2 remediation. To me, that's part of the larger question
3 and also affects the stuff that David's raised about the
4 finances. If I could have more definition around the
5 role, I think then I want to play or can play. I think
6 it would help.

7 To me, if this insurance document is a public
8 document, what is this, the FBI? Is J. Edgar Hoover
9 blacking out what he doesn't want people to see? I want
10 an understanding of not only what's public and what
11 isn't, but maybe is this group an extension of public or
12 is it an extension of the Trust? If we're somewhere in
13 between, it would still seem to me, if it's not public
14 domain, it's still something that we ought to be able to
15 see; and we sign an NDA or something like that. If it's
16 not as black-and-white as that, I don't have a sense.
17 So if we could get at that -- I don't know if you can
18 get at that.

19 MR. KERN: I think we can. We have a pretty
20 long history, and I think I could answer those
21 questions. But I've got it down as another item but not
22 to do it tonight. But it's a good question and
23 something that everybody probably would want to hear
24 about.

25 MR. BERMAN: I second that. It's especially

83

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 useful to the new members, because the bylaws, although
2 the do state a kind of role, they state the role in
3 very, very general terms. And I think Mary's asking for
4 a little more specificity in there.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Could we have a new roster now
6 that we have new members? For example, I was just
7 thinking about how it's important for our committee
8 members to get the agenda and the reminder of the
9 committee meeting.

10 MR. COOPER: The seven new members will be
11 added to the roster, and we'll mail it out.

12 MR. KERN: We need to tie this meeting up with
13 a bow and get out of here. Are there any other items
14 for tonight?

15 In closing, I'd like to, again, welcome the
16 new members. Thanks, everyone, for your participation
17 and good questions. And thank you to Craig and Chris
18 for answering all of our questions and being here
19 tonight; our regulators and the Park Service for coming
20 out tonight on a weeknight.

21 Without objection, meeting adjourned.

22 [MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:32 P.M.]
23
24
25

84

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

2 Sam Berman

3 Jan Blum

4 Bob Boggs, CA Dept. of Toxic Substances Control

5 Craig Cooper, Presidio Trust

Presi di o RABj an03. txt

6 Dennis Downing
7 Joel Hermann
8 Doug Kern
9 Jan Monaghan
10 Chris Nelson, Presi di o Trust
11 James Ponton, Regional Water Quality Control Board
12 David Sutter
13 Brian Ullensvang, National Park Service
14 Mark Youngkin
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

♀
†

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICERS CLUB
BUILDING 50
THE PRESIDIO

February 11, 2003
7:00 p.m.

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

CLARK REPORTING
2161 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 201
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 486-0700

Freddie Reppond, Reporter

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:04 P.M.]

MR. KERN: Welcome, everyone. This is the Presidio Trust Restoration Advisory Board meeting for February 2003. I'd like to welcome everyone here tonight: The Presidio Trust; their contractors and service providers; National Park Service; our state regulatory agencies; RAB community members. Welcome. And if there are any members of the public in the audience tonight, thank you so much for coming out to this meeting.

I'd like to see if everyone has an agenda tonight. Are there any changes? Additions? Okay. Seeing none, before we get started we have a lot of new faces on the Board and some older faces returning to the Board, so let's go around and have some introductions.

I'll start. My name is Doug Kern. I am the facilitator and a community member since 1994.

MR. LEUCKART: I'm Doug Leuckart. I'm a new member on the Board and a resident over on the Union Street side.

MR. FORD: George Ford. I work for the Presidio Trust.

MS. TRIGIANI: Mary Trigiani. I am a community member since last fall; and I live here on the Presidio.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Mark Youngkin, community member

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

and community co-chair. I live at Clay and Presidio.

MR. HERMANN: Joel Hermann, community member for the last year.

MR. DOWNING: Dennis Downing. A community

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

member for about two and a half years.

MR. COOPER: Craig Cooper. I work for the Presidio Trust.

MS. SIEGEL: Sara Siegel. I'm a community member. My second month. I live in Noe Valley.

MS. CHEEVER: Julie Cheever. Community member since late '95, and I live in the Richmond District of San Francisco.

MR. FREY: Mark Frey. I work for the Presidio Trust.

MS. BLUM: Jan Blum, community member on Russian Hill.

MR. SUTTER: Dave Sutter, community member, a year and a half.

MS. WRIGHT: Tracy Wright, community member since about 1998; and I live in the Mission.

MS. MONAGHAN: I'm Jan Monaghan, community member, original member. And I live in Pacific heights.

MR. BOUDRO: John Boudro, new community member, from the East Bay.

MR. ULLENSVANG: Brian Ullensvang with the

4

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

Park Service.

MR. ANDERSON: Jerry Anderson, community member, from San Rafael.

MR. DISTEFANO: Tony Distefano, National Park Service.

MR. KERN: Very good. Do we have any other members that should be sitting up here? Why don't you sit up at the table? Do we have a name tag for this new person? We've been going around and introducing ourselves.

MR. PACE: George Pace, first meeting, community member, from the Peninsula.

MR. KERN: Are there any announcements or recently released documents? Do we have that list?

MR. COOPER: It's one of our slides.

MR. KERN: Very good. It is on the very last page. Any announcements?

MR. YOUNGKIN: I have copies of those reports. I'd like to send those around so that people can look at them during the meeting. They're the recently released documents.

MR. KERN: We have you down here, Craig, for an insurance policy update. Right here at the beginning.

MR. COOPER: Right. My assignment was why --

5

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

we wanted to take a look at two environmental insurance policies that the Presidio Trust purchased way back when we took over the environmental remediation program here at the Presidio.

And, just real briefly, we have two insurance policies. One is called the remediation stocks loss for cost overruns. And the other one is called real estate environmental liability insurance; it's for unknown contamination. And those we purchased from the Zurich American Corporation, an insurance company.

And the question that was posed for me was

Page 2

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

12 what has been released to the public and the RAB is a
13 redacted version, which means certain portions of both
14 insurance policies are blacked out. And I think it was
15 Dave asked me to check to see if the RAB and the public
16 could get a completely unredacted version of both
17 insurance policies. So what I did, I checked in with
18 the Trust management and attorneys, because even though
19 I'm fairly new here at the Trust, I was certain that
20 back in 1997, when these redactions were made, they were
21 made for some reason, either by the Presidio Trust legal
22 department or by Zurich American themselves, so I needed
23 to check in with them. So I checked in with the Trust's
24 management and the legal department of the Trust. I
25 also contacted and spoke with managers at Zurich

6

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 American and attorneys from Zurich American. They have
2 advised me at this point in time that they are looking
3 into what can be released from the redacted version.
4 But they don't feel that all the portions that are
5 currently redacted can be made fully public. I can give
6 you a few examples of why.

7 So that's the response. We were unable to
8 release completely unredacted versions of those
9 insurance policies, at least at this point in time.

10 MR. BERMAN: Any reason why?

11 MR. COOPER: I'm not the best person to answer
12 that question. But the answer in general was -- it's
13 going to be very generic -- it would have a negative
14 impact on the interests of not only the Trust and the
15 federal government with respect to the way we operate
16 and maintain and use these insurance policies, not only
17 at the Presidio, but at other sites, and a negative
18 impact on the interests of Zurich. So that's what they
19 were able to tell me at this point in time.

20 MR. BERMAN: That's not an explanation.

21 MR. ANDERSON: You said you could give
22 examples.

23 MR. COOPER: If you looked at a redacted
24 version, there's certain -- not everything is redacted
25 out.

7

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. BERMAN: Practically everything is
2 redacted out. What's not redacted out is the name of
3 the Trust and the name of the insurance company.
4 Everything else, essentially, is redacted out.

5 MR. COOPER: I would say that is not correct.

6 MR. BERMAN: Not with the copy I looked at.
7 The terms and conditions are all redacted out.

8 MR. COOPER: Well, there are significant -- I
9 would agree that are sections that are redacted out. I
10 think what we can do is that -- some examples of what
11 kind of interests --

12 MR. ANDERSON: You said you could give us some
13 examples. I'm not sure what you had in mind.

14 MR. COOPER: I need to be careful. There are
15 certain sections that are redacted. We could, for
16 example, we have some options on where to go from here.
17 So of those, as an example, is I think when we initially
18 purchased and acquired these environmental insurance

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

19 policies that our presentation was made for the RAB to
20 give an overview of how the policies worked and how they
21 operate. Now we have a lot of new RAB members who were
22 not around to hear that presentation, so I think one way
23 to at least get started on fully understanding these
24 environmental policies is for such a presentation to
25 occur. We can talk about who would provide that

8

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 presentation. Even if you were able to read even the
2 redacted portions that are blacked out, it's still a
3 very difficult insurance policy to understand. I read
4 my own homeowners policy. After reading it, I was
5 asking myself, "Now, what did I just buy and what is
6 excluded and what isn't?" I certainly want to offer
7 that. And I've talked to the folks from Zurich and
8 other parties.

9 I think that would be a very positive step
10 forward to get everyone on an equal footing on just a
11 general knowledge of what both policies provide the
12 Presidio Trust. And in that presentation we can, even
13 though we can't talk about in detail what the redacted
14 versions describe, but we can talk about their general
15 nature. I think, when you hear about their general
16 nature, you may not be so interested in them anymore,
17 because they may not be all that important to how the
18 policies really operate.

19 MR. BERMAN: The devil is in the details in
20 insurance. I've had a lot of experience with public
21 entities and their insurance policies. Let me just say
22 that it's not acceptable to me as a RAB member that this
23 document not be available to the RAB.

24 MR. KERN: Craig and I had an opportunity to
25 talk earlier today about this. He's going to bring up a

9

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 couple of other options, so let's hear that.

2 MR. COOPER: Other than the presentation, as
3 we talked at the last RAB meeting, there's -- you can
4 send in a Freedom of Information Act request. And then
5 the Presidio Trust would follow the rules under the FOIA
6 law on that. And you'd have to contact Zurich and ask
7 them if they still feel that those sections should
8 remain redacted and they'd have to write you back a
9 written explanation. It would start to go into
10 writing -- this would be in writing instead of just
11 verbal -- and explain to you what section under FOIA are
12 we using. There are only certain exemptions under the
13 FOIA law a federal agency can use to redact information.
14 So we would explain to you what exemptions we are using
15 and then we would have to describe again the general
16 nature in writing of the sections that we are redacting.
17 So that's one option.

18 MR. ANDERSON: It's my understanding that the
19 attorney general of the United States has instructed
20 federal employees to stonewall all Freedom of
21 Information requests.

22 MR. FORD: The order has never made it down to
23 the Trust.

24 MR. ANDERSON: It's been reported
25 extensively -- I think it's --

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: Jerry, what I understand from
2 the Department of the Interior is just the opposite.
3 Our lawyers have been instructed to put documents out
4 when asked under FOIA. So it may be just that the
5 attorney general is a long way up the chain, so it may
6 be different interpretations as it's gotten down to
7 different ears.

8 MR. COOPER: We're under no such edict.
9 Definitely the FOIA Act is about releasing information.
10 That's the way the law is written. It's an affirmative
11 law to release information, and an agency only has
12 certain exemptions to use to invoke if they want to
13 withhold information. They have to show it's in the
14 best interests of the federal government to withhold
15 that information, so we have to explain to you why that
16 is.

17 That's one option. So that's two options so
18 far.

19 Third, there is such a thing as a
20 confidentiality agreement that can be done either under
21 a FOIA request or not under a FOIA request where the RAB
22 would designate the person to represent them. They
23 would then be able to look at the redacted information
24 upon signing this confidentiality agreement. I'm not
25 saying it's a good idea or whatever, but then you would

11

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 be able to take a look at it. But you would under
2 certain stipulations not to discuss.

3 MS. SIEGEL: I haven't been in on the previous
4 discussions, but, number one, what is the information
5 that we want to know about the insurance policy. And,
6 two, it seems to me the FOIA process is pretty
7 adversarial I think for the RAB to ask the Trust under
8 FOIA to see this. I know it's not supposed to. That
9 would be my take on it. It would be nice if the
10 Presidio lawyer could come and talk to us some more. Or
11 are there other specifics about the policy?

12 MR. COOPER: I think that's what the
13 presentation would be. We could cover not only how the
14 policies work and operate. Then we could have an
15 attorney here to answer questions if you wanted to not
16 write to FOIA, even though I don't see a FOIA request as
17 adversarial. It's completely your right as a citizen to
18 send in a request to FOIA. We provided a redacted
19 version. If you consider that unsatisfactory, that is
20 the way to start getting things in writing, so there's a
21 record for why, if we do say no to certain things we
22 have to explain why. Then there's an appeal process.
23 If you don't like our reasons why, there's an appeal
24 process that follows under the law.

25 But I think in this special presentation on

12

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 the insurance policies we can, to the extent possible,
2 have an attorney here to try to shine some light on what
3 the general nature of those redacted versions is. Then
4 you can decide as a group to decide how important that

is to you to see.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Did Zurich indicate how much of the document could be unredacted?

MR. COOPER: No. They are willing to take a hard look at all the portions that they redacted back in 1997 and try to free up as much as possible. But there's one particular section that they really feel is important to keep redacted. As soon as I heard that, that it wasn't a hundred-percent release, then we are not there.

MR. BERMAN: Who is it that's concerned about confidentiality, the Trust or Zurich?

MR. COOPER: At this point, I would say both parties.

MR. BERMAN: I'm having a difficult time understanding why either the Trust and/or Zurich feels that this information must be kept confidential. It's an insurance policy for part of the total remediation program and how it's implemented by the Trust. And the RAB has the fiduciary and public responsibility to see a document that relate directly to the implementation of

13

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

the remediation program. Environmental documents are not redacted. I'm not aware, given my year and a half at the Trust, of any other documents that the Trust or a contractor has designated to be redacted. As far as free and open cooperation and collaboration of the RAB and the Trust in overseeing the remediation program, I just find it difficult to understand why an insurance document needs to be secret. That's essentially what you're communicating.

Given the fact that the budget is so critical, perhaps the most critical aspect of the program in many ways, the insurance policy is a buffer to help extend, I think, the RAB in working with the Trust in managing or advising the Trust on how to handle that \$100-million budget and cannot fully discharge its job and responsibilities in this regard if it doesn't know what the insurance policy provides as far as what losses are covered, what losses are not covered. How can we evaluate a Presidio Trust budget if we don't know what is the failsafe portion that the insurance presumably provides? If we do not have the information, how can we discharge our function?

I would suggest to Doug a two- or three-step process to be considered by the RAB. One is the Trust makes its presentation, as Doug has indicated.

14

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

Secondly, that in addition to that presentation, that a member or two of the RAB be designated to view, under the confidentiality provisions, fully unredacted insurance documents. And if either of those procedures -- and that the RAB members would be so designated and would, further, within the confidentiality communication, brief the RAB in addition to the Trust. And if either of those two steps are not acceptable to the majority of the RAB, then I would suggest that we file a FOIA request.

MR. KERN: That seems like a perfectly

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

reasonable way to step through this. I sort of like the idea of a couple of us going to read the document. Hopefully, Dave, you will be one of those.

MR. BERMAN: I would volunteer.

MR. KERN: And someone else to view that. And we could schedule a meeting to see how that works? If it doesn't work for the assembled multitudes, we can go to the last step.

MR. COOPER: Okay. I can definitely bring that back to the Trust and Zurich and see how they feel about that. How about -- my recommendation is after the presentation, because then at that presentation we can give you an idea of the general nature of those redacted versions. Then maybe at that point in time you can

15

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

decide whether that really gets your interest going about them or not.

MR. BERMAN: I, personally, would still want to see them.

MR. COOPER: Regardless?

MR. BERMAN: Yes.

MR. KERN: I think that you will find that most people are going to agree with on that point. People are going to want to see that, simply because it's secret.

MS. CHEEVER: The original policy is from '97?

MR. COOPER: That sounds about right.

MS. CHEEVER: In the general insurance industry as a whole there have been a lot of changes. I think it would be useful if there's a general presentation to the RAB to give an overview of how the coverage amounts may have been changed since the inception of the policy.

MR. BERMAN: Have there been any change in the endorsements?

MR. COOPER: Yes, there's been changes in the endorsements. When the redacted version was released, it was the original policy. And then there's another couple of endorsements already in there, but since then maybe five or six endorsements since then.

16

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

MR. DOWNING: I would suggest you get the confidentiality situation clarified.

MR. ANDERSON: I'm really puzzled about giving an oral presentation of this. Are you saying that you can tell us what's in it but you can't show it?

MR. COOPER: No. Our presentation would definitely elaborate on all the parts that are publicly available.

MR. ANDERSON: You mean you'd only talk about the parts that we could have read anyway?

MR. FORD: There's a lot of business confidentiality stuff that I think they -- Zurich -- would prefer not to disclose. The Trust may not want them disclosed. There's no problem in describing how the policy works and how claims are made against it and the limits and all that stuff. For instance, I believe the policy may have some sections that define the kind of reserves that Zurich is required to keep for a

19 certain period of time to pay claims that we might make.
20 That kind of stuff is important to the policy but
21 doesn't really affect how it operates to us. They may
22 wish to keep that confidential.

23 MR. ANDERSON: The question remains: If you
24 can describe to us orally what you think is important to
25 us, why can't you show it to us? What's the difference?

17

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: First of all, there's portions
2 you can read. But I'm telling you, even if you read a
3 portion, you could read it it's in legalese -- insurance
4 legalese. So I think a presentation that helps you to
5 sort that out would be very helpful. When I came on to
6 the site, for example, Zurich and Trust legal did that
7 for me. And it really helped me, because I was able to
8 read the entire version, the unredacted version. And it
9 was still very difficult to understand. So that's why
10 I'm saying I think a presentation would be very helpful.

11 In the parts that are redacted, we can't
12 explain them to you but we can describe the general
13 nature. That's a vague term but that's what's in the
14 FOIA law. We have to describe the general nature of
15 what we are describing. Obviously, we can't describe in
16 detail, because that would be giving away the
17 confidentiality or business sensitivity or exemption
18 that might be invoked, but we can describe the general
19 nature.

20 MR. DISTEFANO: Dave, I think, made a great
21 suggestion, and I think the RAB should consider
22 switching the order of operations. And that is go for
23 the presentation first. And then if that doesn't
24 suffice, go for the Freedom of Information Act request;
25 and then the confidentiality arrangement. The reason I

18

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 suggest that is twofold. One, when Zurich starts to
2 look through the Freedom of Information Act and what
3 they are going to provide they will probably spend a lot
4 more time at that point than they already have to date
5 deciding what they want to say. And they might decide
6 there's a reason to release all of it. And what they do
7 decide to hold back at that point the full RAB would see
8 what's been released and what hasn't. And then everyone
9 will know what those confidentiality areas are; and that
10 might help frame the future discussion; and people would
11 kind of know of the verboten topics, what not to ask
12 about and that might help you down the road, or whoever
13 decides to take on that confidentiality process. Just a
14 suggestion.

15 MS. WRIGHT: I would be curious to know if
16 there's any sort of urgency. I tend to agree with what
17 Tony said. If there isn't a sense of urgency right said
18 it would be nice to hear a presentation. But if having
19 that option doesn't satisfy the RAB, I think hearing the
20 nature might really make things quite clear. Like
21 George was saying, if we understand what it's all about,
22 we don't necessarily need to know the details. But I'm
23 not quite sure. Can anyone address if there's any
24 urgency that we need know this before the presentation.

25 MR. BERMAN: I wanted to respond to George's

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 comment. It is precisely the business aspect of the
2 policy with Zurich that the insurance company has
3 pledged to respond to provisions that they may have
4 established. That is critical to determine whether or
5 not we have a policy that's funded or a policy that's
6 not -- that will go bust if and when claims are made.
7 So it's precisely the business terms and conditions, the
8 coverages, the stop provisions, the self-insured
9 retentions. All those are basically the nervous system
10 and the pulmonary system of the insurance policy, so we
11 need to know how the insurance policy is structured. We
12 need to know the business pedestal upon which the policy
13 rests. So as far as urgency is concerned, we'd begun
14 the actual remediation on site, and this insurance
15 policy is now in play. We don't have confidence that
16 we've got insurance to cover unexpected lawsuits. We do
17 not know what the program can proceed the way it's
18 scheduled to proceed.

19 MR. HERMANN: I think we are spending money.
20 We do not even know, in some cases, how much we have to
21 spend. Those figures keep adjusting back and forth with
22 new information. As Dave says, it's in effect now, so I
23 think there's a certain amount of urgency. I don't
24 think we need to go another three or four months before
25 we say, "Hey, give us the information."

20

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. KERN: Since this topic is -- just because
2 of the secret nature generating quite a bit of interest,
3 I think we have some options. I don't think we need to
4 get more excited about this than we are. I think we
5 have some proposals. I think it would be good to
6 schedule, if possible, this presentation and --

7 MR. COOPER: Would you like to have it at a
8 RAB meeting, a RAB committee meeting, or would you like
9 for it to be a special meeting?

10 MR. KERN: Committee? Am I seeing "yes" on
11 committee? Okay. More informal then, at the committee
12 meeting.

13 Then George tells me he's got some experience
14 with this. So we may have a couple of people lined up
15 if we do the designated-RAB-member option, which I think
16 maybe we will reserve until we hear this presentation
17 and decide whether to do the FOIA or to have some people
18 read the thing.

19 MR. BERMAN: Maybe I wasn't clear. I think we
20 should do both. We should do the presentation, and we
21 should do the designated confidential but both we need
22 to do them both. Maybe not simultaneously, but we need
23 to do them both.

24 MR. KERN: I want to respect and honor Dave's
25 enthusiasm for this, so if it's okay with the assembled

21

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 group, can we designate a couple of people and have them
2 be scheduled. Is that amenable? Is there consensus
3 there? Can we do that? Seeing mostly nodding heads, I
4 think we should try to move on to other agenda items

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

5 since this was just a short, quick 3-A, after all. We
6 don't want to get hung up on this.

7 MR. COOPER: So you're going to do that
8 request do try to get the confidentiality portion?
9 You'll have to write me about it, designating names of
10 the people you'd like to have. There will be some time
11 involved in preparing one of these agreements. So, if
12 you want to do that before the presentation, that means
13 the presentation is going to be pushed back at least a
14 couple months.

15 MR. BERMAN: It should be done as quickly as
16 possible.

17 MR. KERN: I would schedule the presentation
18 for the next available committee meeting for however it
19 works with the people you need to get there.

20 MR. COOPER: It could be, if I contact these
21 folks, if they're ready by the February committee
22 meeting, I'll contact Mark about that. If they can't
23 make it until March, then that.

24 MR. KERN: We'll get a letter going from us to
25 you about the designated members.

22

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MS. MONAGHAN: I would suggest that maybe the
2 community members come up with a list of questions that
3 we have about the insurance policy to help Zurich.

4 MR. COOPER: Excellent idea. Then I can share
5 that with the person who's going to do the presentation.

6 MS. MONAGHAN: When does it go into effect as
7 well as financial questions. If we could break them
8 down, it might help them prepare.

9 MR. KERN: Can we move on?

10 Thanks, Craig, for all the comments.

11 And Thank you, Dave, for your enthusiasm on
12 pursuing this item.

13 No. 4, "Committee Business." Mark?

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: We had our regular planning
15 committee meeting on January 28th. At this meeting we
16 discussed the following topics. We had a handout from
17 Craig Cooper and the Trust on the various sites included
18 in each remediation action plan and had a brief
19 discussion on that. We had a preliminary discussion on
20 the insurance policy issue that we have been discussing
21 tonight.

22 We also had an update from George Ford on the
23 Landfill 4 removal action that's occurring right now and
24 the Fill Site 5 sampling that was occurring at the time
25 of the committee meeting. Then the remainder of the

23

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 meeting was taken up by a discussion of the Landfill E
2 field sampling results.

3 We scheduled another meeting for the
4 following, which was February 4th, I believe. And we
5 had a special committee meeting that Tuesday night last
6 week.

7 We went over preliminary data from the
8 Landfill E field sampling program. And it was an
9 informal meeting. We had a lot of discussion that
10 evening. Didn't really try to summarize it.

11 So our next meeting will be the planning

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

committee meeting on the fourth Tuesday of this month,
February 25th.

MR. KERN: Any questions for Mark?

Item 5-A. George, landfill sites?

MR. FORD: I've got a lot of pictures, so I'll
try to keep going quickly. And just slow me down if
anything is unclear.

Landfill 4. I wrote a poem about Landfill 4.
I'll recite it for you. "Landfill 4/Is no more."
That's it. It's gone. We took it away. It did cost
some money. The original bid price was about \$590,000.
Because we had a large quantity of Class I California
hazardous waste, the cost went up and we expect when the
numbers are finally totalled it will be right around 1.4

24

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

million. The specific major cost item is we had about
1320 tons of California hazardous waste, which cost us
about 80 bucks a ton to get rid of. It was expensive,
but it's done.

The contractor is now reinstalling all the
utilities at the site, getting ready to place a little
bit of fill. We ended up with a hole next to Central
Magazine Road. We have to place some fill in it to keep
it stable so that the road doesn't eventually fall into
the landfill. So over the next probably about three
weeks we'll be doing those finishing-up chores.

Then, after all that work is done, they will
start planting eucalyptus seeds there to restore that
part of the historic forest.

The clearing and soil profile for disposal are
going on at Fill Site 5. I may have mentioned at the
last meeting, but if you haven't heard I'll say it
again. Test pits that we excavated all around Fill Site
5 indicate that it is smaller than had been estimated.
We thought there were significant quantities of fill
beneath the big flat parking area that is the most
visible part of Fill Site 5. It turns out that most of
that large flat area is underlaid by native soil, which
is uncontaminated. There's just a very thin skin of
fill, really just a few inches to maybe half a foot

25

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

thick, on top of it. So we will scrape that off quite
easily. I don't have a projection for what the quantity
of the landfill will be, but the estimates had ranged up
into the 20,000- to 30,000-cubic yard range. It will be
smaller than that.

Actually, I did bring a map, although I forgot
to bring an easel. But, for the new members, I will
point out where these sites are. On this map of the
Presidio, Landfill 4 is right across the street from
Central Magazine, which, those of you who have not spent
your life driving or walking around the Presidio,
probably have never seen Central Magazine, because it's
hidden away on Rob Hill at the end of a dead-end road.
But anyway this is the one that we finished earlier this
week, and Fill Site 5 is a big, flat parking lot that is
on the western side of Washington Boulevard just south
of the World War II Memorial. That's the one we're
working on right now.

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

19 MS. TRIGIANI: If it's going to be smaller
20 than we anticipate, does that mean we get some of that
21 money back that we spent on Landfill 4?
22 MR. FORD: Yes. We're going to get some of it
23 back, but I think it's unlikely that Fill Site 5 will
24 shrink enough to save us the full \$800,000 extra. At
25 this point I don't have quantities that are good enough.

26

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Really, any number I quote you would be wrong. I think
2 there will be some savings, but it isn't going to wipe
3 out that whole cost.
4 Fill Site 5 has already given us a few other
5 surprises. Last week, we found some belts of practice
6 ammunition from an M-60 machine gun. I'm not a weapons
7 person, so if any of you -- if I'm goofing up the
8 terminology, please break in and straighten me out. But
9 those were found last week. We called the Army and they
10 e-mailed pictures all the way to Maryland and then back
11 to Moffett Field. Eventually, some guys came from
12 Moffett Field and looked at them and said, "Yep, those
13 are blanks," picked them up, and put them in a box and
14 carried them away.

15 This morning actually the contractor's project
16 manager was walking around the site and discovered an
17 unknown object that we don't know what it is. So we are
18 treating it like UX0. I said, "I don't need you finding
19 stuff on this site. Don't do that anymore."

20 Then this afternoon, the contractor was
21 digging. He was moving some soil around. We were
22 trying to mine out a hot spot where we knew we had a
23 high lead concentration. We were trying to segregate
24 all the soil that had high lead levels. When we got to
25 the bottom of what we call a "cell" -- it's basically

27

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 the area where we're digging out the lead soil. Lo and
2 behold, there's diesel and heating oil. It's green and
3 sticky and petroleum all over the place. So we have a
4 petroleum discovery there this afternoon.

5 And anyhow I'm jumping back and forth.
6 MR. KERN: It doesn't show up on any of the
7 groundwater stuff?

8 MR. FORD: No, I didn't. I'll actually show
9 you a picture of it, and we can talk about it a little
10 more. We think it may be related to the oil tank that
11 was across the street, at the former Building 1349, but
12 at this point we are not sure.

13 I realize now that I have these out of order,
14 but I will take you on a quick tour through Landfill 4.
15 [showing slides] This is what it looked like about a
16 year ago. This is a shot taken from Central Magazine
17 Road looking north. You can see that it looked like a
18 eucalyptus forest. That is what it looked like about
19 two weeks ago. This is some of the hazardous waste soil
20 being loaded out into a trailer. It was taken down I-5
21 to Kettleman City to the Class I landfill there. We
22 sent out about 800 truckloads total, so I signed a waste
23 manifest for nearly every single one of them.

24 You can see here they're actually -- they had
25 to back the trucks down Central Magazine Road because

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 it's a dead end. There was not enough room to turn them
2 around. The drivers did a pretty good job of backing.
3 They'd didn't fall into a hole or anything like that.
4 But it's probably 500 or 600 feet of backing.
5 This is what Landfill 4 looks like right now.
6 This is actually a view from the north toward the south,
7 but you can see that all the eucalyptus trees are gone.
8 The fill is gone. What that person is standing on is
9 native soil. It's dune sand. We have found Colma
10 formation. The dune sand here is not really too thick.
11 It's four or five feet thick, and there's Colma
12 formation down below it.

13 This is what the surface looks like now. That
14 is what we'll be dealing with as we build a fill next to
15 the road. Then we will stir in some compost to improve
16 the soil. Then the foresters will come in and plant the
17 new eucalyptus seedlings. We actually had to take out a
18 few utilities. There was a six-inch water line. There
19 was a sewer line. There was an overhead electric line
20 that we had to take out. We're in the process of
21 reinstalling those.

22 Fill Site 5. These are shots taken looking
23 roughly northward from the south edge of Fill Site 5.
24 There's the excavator. They're raking up the brush and
25 debris, getting ready to haul that off. One of the

29

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 things that we have found in abundance at Fill Site 5
2 are tree stumps. The Army must have dumped every tree
3 they had in the last 20 or 30 years on Fill Site 5.
4 There were several hundred that have been pulled out,
5 and they are being hauled off.

6 MR. COOPER: Are they going to be recycled?
7 MR. FORD: Yes. They get shredded and turned
8 into compost, some at Newby Island facility down in
9 Milpitas, and some of them are going to Ox Mountain in
10 Half Moon Bay. But they are being recycled. They are
11 not going to a landfill. To grind these things up, you
12 need a huge machine called a "tub grinder." The Trust
13 doesn't have one. I think they are about half a million
14 bucks for a nice one. We probably won't buy one. It's
15 easier to send it off to the landfill and let them grind
16 it up.

17 MR. DOWNING: Are the eucalyptus seedlings the
18 same as the ones taken out?

19 MR. FORD: Actually, it's a different species.
20 They're kind of doing an experiment at Landfill 4 to try
21 to find less invasive varieties of eucalyptus that still
22 kind of look the way the blue gums do but that do not
23 spread like weeds. But I don't know the scientific name
24 of the seedlings they're putting in, but they're
25 supposed to be less invasive.

30

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Here are some of the machine gun training
2 blanks that we found at Fill Site 5. It's amazing to me
3 that the operator, who was sitting in a Cat 345
4 excavator 12 feet up in the air and 36 feet away at the

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

5 end of the boom, and he saw these things. You can see
6 these are actually blanks. They are 7.62 millimeter
7 machine gun bullets. They are blanks. They don't have
8 a projectile, but they do have gunpowder in them. They
9 are in a belt that feeds into a machine gun just like
10 you saw in the World War II movies. So there's a hand
11 for scale.

12 MS. CHEEVER: Does anybody know the dates of
13 the machine guns?

14 MR. FORD: These guys who are in the
15 camouflage uniforms who came out and picked up those
16 shells said they were manufactured in 1977. So I don't
17 know how they knew it.

18 MR. ULLENSVANG: These guys know their stuff.
19 It's amazing what they can look at and tell you about
20 the history of a piece of metal.

21 MR. FORD: When we see something like that, we
22 put a fence around it and move away and just stay out of
23 the area. And I have to admit we feel a little bit
24 stupid sometimes when you take all these precautions and
25 then the expert comes out and just picks it up and says,

31

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 "Yeah, a bunch of bullets," and throws it in a box and
2 takes it away. Since we don't have that expertise, we
3 play by the books and we try, unless we know exactly
4 what it is, to leave it there and step away.

5 This is the unknown object. And, yes, every
6 joke has already been made about the Coke bottle. That
7 is not the unknown object. The unknown object is in the
8 little white box. It's a cylinder that's about three
9 inches high and maybe an inch and a half in diameter,
10 and it appears to have some kind of handle or
11 appurtenance on the top of it. But we couldn't tell.
12 It did not look like anything we could identify.

13 MR. COOPER: It's so covered with dirt, it's
14 hard to make out.

15 MS. TRIGIANI: So you don't try to remove the
16 dirt to uncover it or open it --

17 MR. FORD: We just leave it there, and we
18 notified the Army. And presumably they'll possibly send
19 the same people from Moffett Field. We found it this
20 morning. Those other shells were found and picked up
21 last week.

22 MS. WRIGHT: Do you know if it's metal or
23 glass?

24 MR. FORD: It looks like it's metal. Up
25 close, it appears to be like a little metal can. So my

32

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 hope is, with the machine gun blanks, now we know what
2 they look like. If we see some more, we will know that
3 civilization does not have to come to a screeching halt
4 just because they've found machine gun blanks.

5 MR. BERMAN: George, how did you determine
6 that this was suspicious?

7 MR. FORD: We looked at it. "Gee, this is a
8 landfill where we found some other explosives that had
9 some explosives in it and we don't know what this is."
10 It's quite possible that we are being excessively
11 cautious here, and the Army may laugh at us when they

12 come out. What I would prefer to do is develop a
13 knowledge base. If we start seeing the same things over
14 and over again, presumably we can be more efficient and
15 put them in a pile, and they come out once. So I have
16 told the contractor and the operators that, with no
17 prejudice to the crews, if they see anything they do not
18 understand, I would rather have them stop and start
19 making phone calls than to take any kind of action,
20 because we don't know.

21 MR. BERMAN: I know, but when you're
22 excavating a landfill, it could be dozens upon dozens of
23 things that are not known immediately to an operator.
24 Are there any kind of guidelines that you can establish,
25 because contractors can be stopping every 15 minutes if

33

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 he sees a bottle he does not recognize.

2 MR. FORD: We have a written UXO -- unexploded
3 ordnance -- policy that the Trust follows, but it does
4 not -- it really leaves it up to the person's judgment
5 as far as a determination of what's the unknown object.
6 I've talked with this contractor. I'm not too worried
7 about them stopping or just finding an excuse to stop,
8 because these guys would much rather dig. They don't
9 like it when they have to stop.

10 MR. COOPER: And they don't stop for very
11 long. They just set up the fence and recommence work
12 someplace else. They make the proper notifications to
13 get the right people involved, and then they move over
14 someplace else.

15 MR. BERMAN: So they're working under some set
16 of guidelines?

17 MR. COOPER: Absolutely. Our
18 health-and-safety officer gave them -- especially since
19 the mustard-agent-bottle issue, we have specific
20 procedures now that not only that we trained our own
21 employees but our contractors also. And, also, Paul
22 Martin from our health-and-safety office sat down with
23 George's contractors and did a formal safety talk with
24 them about the rules on our unknown-object policy. And
25 they're guided by those policies.

34

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MS. SIEGEL: Are there geologists on site or
2 just on call?

3 MR. FORD: On call.

4 MS. SIEGEL: Because there may be something
5 that is of archeological significance.

6 MR. FORD: I'd have to say, at this job site,
7 we're following a policy that's over and above the Trust
8 policy. And that's "George's policy," which is, if
9 there's any doubt, I expect people to call me and to
10 kind of sound the alarm, because, in my view, some of
11 those things are difficult judgments. I don't want an
12 excavator operator to make a difficult judgment. I'd
13 rather have them call me and pass the responsibility up
14 the chain and let somebody else who gets paid to make
15 judgments do it.

16 MR. COOPER: We don't want any incidents. If
17 we have some incidents at one of our first landfill
18 excavations, it can put our whole landfill program in

19 jeopardy. I think being careful, especially at the very
20 beginning, is very prudent.

21 MS. SIEGEL: You said the petroleum find was
22 at the same site. Did you do something to mitigate any
23 kind of -- this just was pooling at the bottom?

24 MR. FORD: We don't actually have liquid-phase
25 petroleum, but what we have is just grossly contaminated

35

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 soil. In fact, I've got some pictures I can show you.
2 The petroleum doesn't usually get classified.
3 Petroleum-bearing soil normally wouldn't get classified
4 as a hazardous waste. There's a petroleum exclusion.
5 Having said that, if it's got a lot of petroleum in it,
6 it's hard to get rid of. Not a lot of landfills want
7 it, and sometimes you have to send it off somewhere
8 where they basically cook it out.

9 The color is really terrible on this
10 projector. What's happening here is that the native
11 ground surface probably goes somewhere right around in
12 here [indicating]. All this material is fill. Out in
13 the field, this is actually a gray-green and had a
14 fantastically strong petroleum odor. The petroleum
15 staining extended down into the bottom of the hole and
16 westward probably 30 or 40 feet. So it was basically a
17 big streak of petroleum.

18 This is something that we are going to have to
19 deal with in the second stage of this landfill removal.
20 What we will do is take the fill off first and send it
21 off to a landfill. Then after that, we will basically
22 go back in and start digging from the area where we know
23 we have petroleum and dig outward in each direction and
24 follow it wherever it goes.

25 At this point, we think it's likely the

36

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 petroleum probably came from a former oil tank that used
2 to be located right across the street from this landfill
3 site. There was a 100,000-gallon steel above-ground
4 storage tank that was used in the early days for heating
5 oil and actually fed an underground heating oil piping
6 system that went everywhere on Presidio. After the
7 advent of gas heat and the Army started decommissioning
8 a lot of their oil furnaces, they stopped using this
9 piping system and the tank to distribute heating oil,
10 and they used it to store diesel, which they used to run
11 generators and vehicles. We know the tank leaked,
12 because the Army did a cleanup on the opposite side of
13 the street. They extended their cleanup into the Fill
14 Site 5 area just across the road. And I believe they
15 pretty much thought they were finished. They didn't --
16 they were out of the petroleum or they had achieved
17 cleanup levels when they stopped digging. So we suspect
18 that there may be an unknown distribution pipe that came
19 down here and leaked this stuff. It's also possible
20 that there was a -- oil can flow in a utility trench
21 that has a gravel backfill. A lot of times something
22 like that will act as a conduit and let it flow a long
23 distance before it spills out wherever the trench ends.
24 So at the moment I can't tell you how this petroleum got
25 here, but I would expect that by the time we finish

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 digging it up, if there's a pipe, we will have found it.
2 If it just got here by migrating through fractures in
3 the bedrock, we'll know that, too.
4 MS. SIEGEL: I don't know if the Trust has an
5 on-site thermal soil treatment unit that the Army used
6 to have.
7 MR. FORD: We don't. There is a similar unit
8 in Richmond that does still operate. And if we dig this
9 soil out and it really has a lot of petroleum in it that
10 is an option that we will consider for treating the
11 soil. The thermal soil treatment unit over in Richmond
12 will be available for our use. I would count that as a
13 bad surprise. I think one of the difficult parts about
14 it is that we do apparently have contamination down in
15 the native soil, in bedrock. The whole idea with Fill
16 Site 5 was to remove the fill and go back down to the
17 original native soil. I think in this case, we are
18 going to have to take out a certain amount of native
19 soil and weathered bedrock to solve that problem. I'm
20 glad that today is over with respect to Fill Site 5.
21 This is Class III soil with little plant roots
22 and things. It has too much soil to be recycled, and
23 this was hauled out earlier today. So even everyday
24 Fill Site 5 is getting smaller. Even with all these
25 discoveries and problems, we still are managing to move

38

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 the soil, so it is shrinking.
2 The next item I want to introduce people to is
3 the next RAP that is coming down the pike. It is a
4 restoration remediation action plan for Baker Beach
5 Disturbed Areas 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6.
6 MR. BERMAN: At 4 when is the restoration work
7 scheduled to start? I know that's not your bailiwick.
8 MR. FORD: It should be starting by the end of
9 February. We have to put some compost in the soil and
10 install an irrigation system. I hope that will be done
11 within the next two weeks. And then I would expect them
12 to be out there planting afterwards.
13 MR. BERMAN: Similarly, with Fill Site 5?
14 MR. FORD: Yeah.
15 MR. DISTEFANO: Dave, I wanted to talk to one
16 of your points you brought up earlier about a concern
17 that there's a lot of debris that's not recognizable
18 that could slow down the process. Sarah brought up
19 archeology. And historic architects that specialize in
20 landfill monitoring put out pretty good cheat-sheets of
21 what things are from different areas and diagnostics
22 that help us tell what these things are. That really
23 helps ferret out the process as to what's recognizable
24 and what's not. That's something they use in the field.
25 MR. BERMAN: I was just concerned about the

39

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 contractor's personnel that they have a set of
2 guidelines and that they don't stop each time that they
3 see something. I think from what Craig and George have
4 said that that is being managed.

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

5 MR. FORD: The schedule for the next RAP.
6 We're working on right now both on the RAP and the
7 design documents. We're working on right now. CEQA
8 documents are also being prepared. Our goal is to try
9 to get the RAP finalized and contractors on board to
10 clean up these sites in the fall of this year. That's
11 probably a tall order. It's basically a lot of
12 paperwork to get out of the way by the end of the
13 summer, but we are working with the Park Service and the
14 regulators to do it as quickly as we can.

15 Now, to show you, I have some pictures of
16 those cleanup sites. This is actually a panorama that
17 shows -- this is taken from over by the golf course.
18 Basically, this is the section of the coastline where
19 Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 3 and 4 are located. I
20 should point out that even though they're called
21 "disturbed areas," they're just landfills. All it is is
22 a pile of dirt and debris that the Army dumped there.
23 We do not recognize any significance in the name
24 "disturbed area." We're using that name because the
25 Army started out calling them "disturbed areas." But

40

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 every time I say "disturbed area," you can think
2 "landfill."

3 MR. KERN: As a point of historical
4 significance, the Army actually numbered all their
5 landfills in a row and called them "Landfill 1,"
6 "Landfill 2," and so on. It was in their RI process
7 that they began to rename or obfuscate with these fill
8 site versus landfill versus disturbed area, so it's kind
9 of a graded area.

10 MR. FORD: The Army was pretty creative in
11 some of their terminology. You can actually see Baker
12 Beach Disturbed Area 3 there on this picture. And it's
13 on the west, facing the coastal bluffs, getting right
14 down towards the beach. In another month or so, I'll
15 come back and tell you about Baker Beach Disturbed Areas
16 1 and 2, which are actually little veneers of fill
17 sitting on these cliffs here. So those of who you are
18 subject to vertigo shouldn't attend that night.

19 MR. BERMAN: Basically, they just dumped stuff
20 over the cliff, right?

21 MR. FORD: Right. That's how they got rid of
22 a lot of the stuff.

23 This tiny map shows Baker Beach Disturbed Area
24 3, which is essentially a filling of a gully that is
25 right down the hill from Fill Site 5. If you just walk

41

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 straight downhill from Fill Site 5 across Lincoln
2 Boulevard, you will then be on Baker Beach Disturbed
3 Area 3. What it was was a naturally occurring gully in
4 the sand dunes that the Army filled up with soil and
5 building rubble.

6 The map also shows down at the bottom Baker
7 Beach Disturbed Area 4, which is really a veneer fill
8 that is for the most part buttressing a portion of
9 Lincoln Boulevard. Now, of these two sites, Baker Beach
10 Disturbed Area 3 covers a substantial area and has
11 several tens of thousands of cubic yards of waste in it.

12 We think the part of Baker Beach Disturbed Area 4 that
13 has to be removed is about 180 cubic yards, so it's
14 quiet a bit smaller.

15 MR. BERMAN: How will you get stuff out of
16 there?

17 MR. FORD: We are still working on it. A
18 conveyor is one thing that we have looked at. We may
19 just push it uphill and pick out the big pieces and doze
20 it uphill and load it on trucks.

21 As the project goes along, we can talk about
22 some of the difficulties. One of the biggest problems
23 with Baker Beach 3 and 4 is that we don't have a lot of
24 flat space to spread out and work. Also, the access to
25 both sites are on the downhill kind of sinuous portion

42

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 of Lincoln Boulevard. It's really a bad place for
2 trucks to be stopping and turning. We have some ideas
3 about how we're going to solve those problems, but I
4 think traffic control is going to be one of the premier
5 issues for these landfills.

6 MR. BERMAN: Have you considered barging it
7 away?

8 MR. FORD: I don't think it will be
9 cost-effective to barge it away. But for Baker Beach 1
10 and 2, which we'll talk about in another month or so, we
11 are looking very closely at barging it, because we think
12 that carrying it away by water offers a lot of
13 advantages.

14 So, anyhow, let me tell you something about
15 these chemicals. The chemicals that we're worried about
16 in Baker Beach 3 and 4 are generally metals,
17 specifically cadmium, cobalt, lead, and zinc. There are
18 some pesticides -- DDT, chlorodane, and dieldrin; and
19 there are some PCBs. This is kind of a mixed bag for a
20 landfill. Kind of the normal thing we see in the --

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: You might want to point out
22 that most of those are not associated with Baker Beach
23 4. Most of those COCs are only at 3.

24 MR. FORD: Is it just metals that we have?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe it's lead and

43

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 chlorodane, but I know it's lead that seems to be one of
2 the major things.

3 MR. FORD: Brian brings up a good point, which
4 is that most of the contaminants are in Baker Beach 3.
5 This project is such that, let's say \$3 million is for
6 cleaning this up. \$2.95 million will get spent on Baker
7 Beach 3, maybe 40 or 50 thousand on the other one. It's
8 kind of an elephant with a flea on his back. The
9 probable remedy which we expect to be selected by RAP
10 will be to excavate and remove the fill. We think that
11 right now our best estimates are that Baker Beach 3
12 contains about 32,000 yards of cubic waste. And Baker
13 Beach 4 about 180 cubic yards.

14 MR. LEUCKART: How will you support Lincoln
15 Boulevard after that fill is removed?

16 MR. FORD: I think the answer is we won't take
17 any fill that is actually supporting Lincoln Boulevard.
18 We think that at Baker Beach 3 the fill that's

19 contaminated is not actually up against Lincoln
20 Boulevard. So we will be able to stay away. At 4, we
21 think we can take it off in a thin skin. We'll probably
22 have backfill at the ready so as soon as we take it off
23 we can immediately replace it.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: At Baker Beach 4, the
25 contamination is in a very small area of the fill. It's

44

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 not the entire area. It's cross-hatched.

2 MR. FORD: It will be maybe skimming off a
3 little pocket. We won't do anything that endangers
4 Lincoln Boulevard. It's very important to us that we
5 keep it in place, open, and operating.

6 MS. TRIGIANI: Was Lincoln Boulevard
7 constructed after this landfill was started

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: I believe the road was there
9 first. I think there's a couple operations at both
10 Baker Beach 3 and 4 where there was work done to help
11 support the road after the road was built. So the upper
12 portion of Baker Beach 3 appears to be built of
13 engineered material to help hold the road. It's all
14 engineered material, and most of it appears to be
15 uncontaminated. It's all been tested. Only one area
16 had, I believe, lead and chlorodane, so it's a very
17 small part.

18 MS. TRIGIANI: It's not spread throughout the
19 fill?

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: It appears to be localized in
21 one area at Baker Beach 4. Baker Beach 3 has two
22 sections -- the area that's holding up the road and more
23 of gully that's been filled. And the gully that's been
24 filled is the majority of what George is talking about.

25 MS. TRIGIANI: It's all mixed throughout?

45

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: Right. In the lower portion;
2 not in the area supporting the road.

3 MS. SIEGEL: Could you just explain "veneer
4 fill"?

5 MR. FORD: The idea is that if we have soil
6 banked against the road that's holding up the road, we
7 will take a layer of that soil off. Then we will
8 immediately replace it with a layer of clean soil of
9 similar thickness so that we don't change the
10 configuration of the bank that's holding up the road.
11 It may be that the configuration would actually be
12 changed while we are digging it, maybe over the course
13 of one day. But, as soon as we take the waste away, we
14 will put in replacement clean fill to continue the
15 buttressing effect that it has on the road.

16 Here's pictures of Baker Beach 3 from the
17 water, but you can see that it's essentially a gully but
18 has been filled up. There's now quite a few trees and
19 large shrubs growing on it. And I have a few other
20 pictures. This picture -- I should give credit for
21 it -- came from a website called
22 californiacoastline.org. It's a person who has made it
23 their personal project to digitally photograph the
24 entire length of the California coast. And he's almost
25 done and the pictures are posted on the website. You

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 can download them. And they're better than you could
2 buy. His wife is a helicopter pilot. She flies along
3 and he hangs out the back and takes pictures. They're
4 really useful. It has been, especially, for those
5 sites. You can't get this view of Baker Beach 3 without
6 an airplane or helicopter.

7 MS. TRIGIANI: You're saving the Trust's
8 money.

9 MR. FORD: I should also point out that Baker
10 Beach 4 is visible. It's right in this little area.
11 This is a dirt access roads that comes up and intersects
12 Lincoln Boulevard. Baker Beach 4 is a little pocket of
13 fill on that slope. This is the sand ladder that goes
14 down to Baker Beach, which I would recommend as a lot of
15 fun to walk down, not so much fun going back up.

16 MR. KERN: Within that box, about two-thirds
17 the way down, if you were foolish enough to walk down
18 that gully, which I have been, there's lots of exposed
19 beams and rubble, so there really is a lot of debris
20 down at the bottom.

21 MR. FORD: And it's very coarse debris. There
22 are big, like, big 16-inch square section wood beams,
23 the kind that are not even used anymore. Very large
24 chunks of concrete. Even though you can't see rubble in
25 this picture because the vegetation is hiding it, there

47

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 is a lot of rubble out at that site.
2 This is what the site looks like from Lincoln
3 Boulevard looking down that road. The gravel road there
4 is an access road that goes to Battery Crosby, which is
5 the battery that's kind of on the ridge line. And,
6 actually, the position of the road is one of the things
7 that we're dealing with in the planning and engineering
8 process, because we need to maintain access to Battery
9 Crosby, so we will be doing some research to figure out
10 -- we know the configuration of the road changed as they
11 dumped more fill in there. So we will try to figure out
12 what is the historic alignment of the access road so
13 that when we finish removing the fill, there will be a
14 much more pronounced gully in this area. After we've
15 finished we will want to realign the road to what it was
16 before the gully was filled in.

17 In this picture, virtually everything to the
18 right side of the road is fill. There's actually some
19 fill to the left side of the road, but the majority of
20 it is to the right. All those tall shrubs are growing
21 on fill and rubble.

22 This is the view from Baker Beach looking
23 right up the gully. You can kind of get a feeling for
24 the big prism of fill that was dumped in here. You can
25 see the "V" shape, which is the natural gully that's

48

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 been eroded in the Colma formation of the bluffs. Then
2 there's this big plug of fill that they just dropped
3 down in the gully. And the fill has all the trees and
4 tall shrubs going on it. When we take all that out,

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

5 that diamond-shaped plug in the middle will be gone. It
6 will just be a gully down in the sand dunes, as it was
7 before the Army filled it up.

8 Baker Beach 4 is basically a little pocket on
9 that hillside. The fill that makes up Baker Beach 4 is
10 basically banked up against Lincoln Boulevard and it
11 extends for some distance out of this picture. But the
12 area where the fill has been found to be contaminated is
13 right in here. It's basically, just a pocket, kind of
14 an area on this slope. We are trying to figure out
15 whether we can try to clean it up by reaching down and
16 pulling it up with an excavator. We may have to bring
17 some equipment down to the bottom and work up. It's
18 kind of a small chore compared to the amount of work
19 that it will take to remove Baker Beach 3.

20 You can't tell from here, but most of this
21 slope is actually covered with iceplant, which turns out
22 to be a reasonable indicator. A lot of times where you
23 see iceplant, it's on fill. The iceplant will invade
24 native dune sands but it usually gets started on fill
25 first.

49

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Out of deference to our reporter, should we
2 take a break?

3 [A BREAK WAS TAKEN FROM 8:31 P.M. TO 8:45 P.M.]

4 MR. FORD: Fill Site 6 is the third portion of
5 this RAP that we are now working on and hope to complete
6 this summer. Fill Site 6 has a big footprint. This is
7 an early drawing of the footprint. It is an area on the
8 Main Post. You can see Halleck Street and Lincoln
9 Boulevard. This is just north of the Trust's main
10 offices and Building 35. You can see Doyle Drive at the
11 top of the figure.

12 It's an area that basically contains soil and
13 building debris. It's thought that most of the building
14 debris results from demolition from the original early
15 Letterman Medical Center, which was knocked down around
16 1975. And that fill was spread out in various areas.
17 In some areas, new buildings, parking-lots, and things
18 have actually been built on top of the fill. There is
19 one parcel in particular in the southwest corner that
20 looks somewhat rectangular where there is a substantial
21 thickness of fill, clear up to about 14 feet thick.
22 That also happens to straddle the Tennessee Hollow
23 riparian corridor. So we're proposing a two-part remedy
24 for this site; that is, to remove the fill that is
25 within and surrounding the Tennessee Hollow riparian

50

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 corridor where the ecological cleanup levels apply. And
2 that for the thinner bodies of fill that are now
3 distributed in a much larger area and are by and large
4 under parking-lots and buildings, we'd like to propose
5 the use of land-use controls to make sure that that
6 stuff is not disturbed, or if there is a construction
7 project in this much larger footprint that the fill will
8 be properly handled. We'll be talking about that as the
9 RAP develops.

10 The chemicals of concern are Aroclor 1260,
11 which is a PCB and mercury. As I just said, the remedy

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

is to excavate and remove the deep fill from the Tennessee Hollow corridor and use land-use controls for other areas where the bodies of fill are relatively thin. The estimated volume of the fill soil that's in and around the Tennessee Hollow corridor right now is about 33,000 yards. That will probably change as work progresses.

MR. COOPER: One note on the contaminants. The PCB contamination in the area that we're excavating is more widespread.

MR. FORD: Like a lot of the landfills at the Presidio, it's fairly light levels of contamination. Because they're in ecological restoration areas, we have very low eco cleanup levels that apply. This is a shot

51

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

of the big fill at Fill Site 6. This was taken from the sidewalk on Lincoln Boulevard in front of the YMCA building. And that big grassy area is all fill. It's 12 to 14 feet thick in some portions of that. That's what we are proposing to remove.

Here's another view angled a little bit more to the northwest of the same body of fill.

MS. CHEEVER: Is this the area where there was some trench that the RAB was invited to see?

MR. FORD: Yes.

MS. CHEEVER: But didn't that trench show there wasn't as much as was expected; or is that another part?

MR. FORD: Contamination? Actually, I believe the contamination was primarily found -- wasn't it discovered in soil borings?

MR. ULLENSVANG: At the time of the trenching, the big mound was thought to be debris. And the area where there was not a big mound was thought to be soil. And just the opposite was the truth. What later came out in the testing was that the soil had PCBs in it, so it did kind of a flip-flop in everyone's mind. It went from suspect debris to soil that looked clean. Then the chemistry came back and there was some PCB in it. You do remember the way it was at the times.

52

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

MR. FORD: Your memory is good. Our story changed.

This is a view taken looking toward the west. You can see the thickness of the fill here. That parking lot is about 15 or 16 vertical feet below the level of Halleck street and Lincoln. That's the thickness of fill. It's probably at least 12 feet thick in that picture. That's what we would be taking out. Actually, if this fill were not here, you would see Tennessee Creek traverses this part of the site. It's right now in a 72-inch-diameter reinforced concrete pipe. A portion of this project will be, after we remove the fill, we'll take out the pipe and daylight Tennessee Creek across this site. So we think that'll look considerably better when we're done.

This is a view down the beautiful channel of Tennessee Creek. It's in the pipe. The pipe is on the left side of the photograph under the bushes. That's

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

19 what it looks like. So some of the design and remedial
20 decisions that we will be making is how far to extend
21 the cleanup and how much of the pipe to take out. We
22 have a consultant, Greg Hammond, who has been working on
23 the Tennessee Hollow project, and is also going to help
24 us design a new channel for the creek so that it looks
25 decent and will function properly.

53

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 So this site in particular has all kinds of
2 utility issues that we have not faced so far. It's got
3 a spiderweb of underground pipes -- water pipes, sewer
4 pipes -- overhead utilities that will have to be
5 rerouted, so we will be spending quite a bit of time
6 figuring out how to deal with all that stuff. Since
7 it's right in the middle of the Presidio it's a very
8 visible site so we have to figure out how to do the work
9 in a tidy fashion.

10 MR. COOPER: If we at the Trust can list our
11 priorities for year 2003, those three sites are our No.
12 1 priority. Because we need to write a RAP, they're
13 scheduled for remedy implementation this year, so our
14 hands are really full this year -- to get the paperwork
15 in place and the design and to get the remedy started --
16 all in 2003. And that is a huge priority for us for
17 calendar year 2003.

18 MS. BLUM: This may be incorrect information,
19 and I know you'll tell me if I'm wrong, but my
20 understanding of the footprint of the overhead Doyle
21 Drive is going to go into that area of the new off-ramp.
22 And, No. 2, how is that going to affect what we're
23 doing?

24 MR. FORD: The new off-ramp will not go into
25 Fill Site 6. It will hit ground before it reaches Fill

54

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Site 6. But the new off-ramp and the future project to
2 rehabilitate Doyle Drive will have an affect on -- we
3 have a petroleum correction site called the Building
4 207-231 Site. Doyle Drive cuts right across the middle
5 of it. So it will not be an issue for Fill Site 6, but
6 a huge issue for 207-231 petroleum cleanup. We are
7 studying that now, how to figure out how to phase it.
8 Any work that we can off-load onto Caltrans, we'd be
9 very pleased to do that. I don't know whether we will
10 be able to do that or not, but we are trying to make
11 sure that, for the 207-231 project, our work dovetails
12 nicely with Caltrans so there isn't wasted effort.

13 MR. HERMANN: Are those sites impacted
14 regardless of the final alternative [inaudible]

15 MR. FORD: 207 and 31 is a kind of a site that
16 is long in the north-south direction. And Doyle Drive
17 does cuts right across the middle of it, so no matter
18 what we do there the Doyle Drive planning is going to
19 affect it. Building 207-231 is -- here's 231, which is
20 a former Army gas station. It had a tank farm out in
21 front on the north side of it. And they leaked and the
22 plume went northward towards which is now the marsh.
23 Building 207 was one of these little kinky buildings.
24 It was another gas station that the Army had down on
25 Mason Street. It had less severe leaks, which the Army

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 has partially cleaned up already, but the 207-231
2 cleanup area kind of forms a bulb in there. And no
3 matter how we do it Doyle Drive will cross it.
4 This is Fill Site 6 here. And most of it is
5 just far enough south that we don't think Doyle Drive or
6 the new Richardson Avenue slip-ramp will affect it.
7 MR. KERN: Craig, when you mentioned getting
8 everything done for those three sites and excavating the
9 three sites, when do you foresee getting out the
10 document and then the contracting and the bid
11 protests -- you're planning for the bid protest?
12 MR. COOPER: Right. We would like to have the
13 public comment period on the draft RAP. And we want to
14 have that happen this summer. And so then we can
15 finalize the bid and continue the design and start the
16 procurement process shortly thereafter. Actually,
17 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5 went fine for us until the
18 bid protest. We got the RAP done in an okay time frame
19 and got the procurement papers in place, but it's the
20 bid protest that hurt us, that kicked us into the rainy
21 season. We're going as fast as we can. We want to try
22 to get things done sooner this year than last year, and
23 I hope we can.
24 MR. SUTTER: Maybe you should build some room
25 into your schedule.

56

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. FORD: We're looking at stretching out our
2 contract award process to make an allowance for
3 protests.
4 MS. BLUM: Are you thinking that you're going
5 to do all three simultaneously or consecutively or two
6 and one?
7 MR. FORD: It's a good question. We haven't
8 thought that far, but we will be soon. We have to make
9 those decisions very soon. My own preference would
10 be -- 3 and 4 need to go together. The sites are
11 probably far enough apart that we could get away with
12 doing them simultaneously, but one of the things we're
13 learning from doing 4 and 5, I think there is a finite
14 tolerance for Park residents and users have for having
15 trucks all over the place. And, being mindful of that,
16 the way I'm leaning at the moment would be to do them
17 consecutively, because otherwise to do them concurrently
18 there would be some days where there would be literally
19 hundreds of trucks on the Presidio, not even counting
20 the Lucas project traffic.
21 MR. COOPER: We've got the Baker Beach sites
22 first, so that would be before the rainy season.
23 MR. FORD: I worry a lot more about trying to
24 do the Baker Beach 3 and 4 sites in the winter, because
25 there's sand underneath there. It's highly erodable.

57

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 It would be a tough site to work. I think Fill Site 6,
2 I'd rather do it in sunny weather, but if we had to do
3 that in February I think it's doable.
4 MS. BLUM: But you would bid them together to

5 get some economy?
6 MR. FORD: We'll think about that. I'm not
7 sure whether we will or not. One strategy that I could
8 outline is that if you think there's a high likelihood
9 that you will get a bid protest, if the wrong person
10 wins then why not divide it into two jobs and maximize
11 the chances that the usual protester wins one of them
12 and will therefore shut up and get to work. We have to
13 think about that. We have to talk with our procurement
14 department about whether they think they could
15 administer two large construction contracts going at the
16 same time, because if they can't then that may be a very
17 big incentive to put them together. Those are all
18 things to consider and work through now.
19 MS. CHEEVER: Are there any procedural or
20 legal requirements like scoping or some steps in the
21 legal process that have to be completed before you can
22 do Fill Site 6; or can you just go ahead and do Fill
23 Site 6?
24 MR. FORD: Well, the Fill Site 6 RAP will go
25 through its own EPA evaluation. And, once that's

58

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 complete, I believe we will be in a position to go to
2 work. Now we are coordinating it with the Tennessee
3 Hollow people and to try to make sure that we leave it
4 in a condition that is satisfactory for the work that
5 they will want to do later. We don't want to close any
6 doors on them by the work that we do. I should point
7 out that it's also possible that we will not be
8 relocating Tennessee Creek outside of the limits of the
9 site where we dig. Right now, it's in a pipe going
10 under a parking-lot. There's some thought that it does
11 not follow the historical alignment of Tennessee Creek.
12 So it's possible that, at some future date, we'll take
13 it out of that pipe in the parking lot and move it to
14 where it originally ran. That gets outside the scope of
15 Fill Site 6 removal. And if we construct a day-lighted
16 creek on Fill Site 6, it's possible that some additional
17 grading will have to be done in the future to reconnect
18 that channel with other restored parts of Tennessee
19 Creek, if the alignment is going to change. But we're
20 trying to do that in a way that there will be minimal
21 wasted effort or money wasted for the.

22 MS. BLUM: I don't say a deduction will be
23 made. I think this year a final alternative will be
24 made in '03. I think my concern remains, since we are
25 not sure where that footprint will be -- maybe you

59

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 are -- I don't know where that footprint will go from
2 Doyle Drive. What I'm trying to say is, is there any
3 way that we can postpone on this particular fill site
4 until we know what's going on with it?

5 MR. FORD: I don't believe any Doyle Drive
6 alternative will land on Fill Site 6. But your question
7 is relevant for the 207-231 petroleum cleanup. The
8 answer is we're going to postpone -- we are working on
9 creating an alternative action plan there. But that
10 plan won't be final after the Doyle Drive alternative is
11 selected. So we will be kind of fitting that document

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

12 around decisions that are made on Doyle Drive so what
13 cleanup we do makes since in the context of what is
14 going to be done with Doyle Drive. We're monitoring it.
15 We're aware that the Doyle Drive project will have a
16 huge effect on the 207-231 cleanup. We're not going to
17 rush out there and do anything prematurely. I hate to
18 spend money if I can get Caltrans to do it for free. If
19 they're going to be tunnelling across that site, which
20 is one of the favorite alternatives, we are not. In
21 that kind of scenario, we would just probably clean up
22 the petroleum and then stop and leave the rest of it for
23 Caltrans to dig it out once. It's a real issue. We're
24 trying to pay attention to it and make sure that our
25 cleanup process dovetails with what Caltrans is going to

60

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 do. So I actually worry more that the history of
2 Caltrans' efforts to replace Doyle Drive we may get in a
3 situation where two or three years out they still have
4 not taken the next step beyond selecting an alternative.
5 We may get tired of waiting and then have to decide what
6 our bottom line is. But we don't want to do any work
7 that doesn't have to be done.

8 MS. BLUM: Thank you for trying to answer
9 those.

10 MR. FORD: If we could talk about the
11 petroleum program. The Park Service -- Jim and Bob are
12 not here tonight -- but Jim is working on updating two
13 Board orders that apply to the Presidio. They're 91082
14 and 96070. We expect the result of his work will be in
15 sometime later this year, could be early next year. But
16 after we've gone through this process, the Water Board
17 will issue a new order that covers the Presidio that
18 will incorporate the relevant parts of the old orders.
19 It will add in new things that might be discovered s.o.
20 we are trying work with Jim to make sure that our
21 concerns and the concerns of the Park Service and the
22 Trust are considered in the drafting of new Board
23 orders. That's why I think it will take a little while
24 to get those finalized.

25 This next item, the petroleum, was e-mailed

61

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 out last week. I had intend to bring hard copies to
2 pass out tonight and just got too far behind and didn't
3 make them. If anybody would like to have a hard copy,
4 raise your hand and I'll make a list and mail them to
5 anybody who wants one. I didn't want to go through a
6 detailed presentation of the petroleum program tonight,
7 partly because Jim is not here. I would prefer to
8 reserve that maybe to next month and give a brief
9 presentation when Jim is here. But I would urge you, if
10 you want to get a snapshot of where the petroleum
11 program is right now, to read that plan. It's only
12 about four or five pages, and you can probably ignore
13 the tables in the back and just read the tables and
14 you'll still get about the whole story. But, if you
15 read that and have questions next month or at our
16 committee meeting, I would be happy to answer. I will
17 point out that the work on corrective action sites
18 which -- again, corrective action sites are sites where

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

19 you have a big petroleum spill that has affected
20 groundwater. So there are major petroleum cleanup sites
21 at Building 1567, 231, and the Military Post Exchange,
22 Building 1349. And we are working along on all of
23 those. We have various documents that will be coming
24 out for you to review. And we'll let you know when
25 they're ready. And I think it's about time for me to

62

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 stop talking.

2 This is the update on the groundwater
3 monitoring program. Looks like the agencies and the RAB
4 are now reviewing the second quarter 2002 report. And
5 there are other ones in the pipeline, which will be
6 coming out shortly.

7 MR. COOPER: I'd like to briefly give the RAB
8 an update on where we are with our most significant
9 CERCLA project. As George mentioned briefly, our next
10 RAP, the one we are working on right now, includes those
11 cliff sites, but the Baker Beach Disturbed Sites 1 and 2
12 are more complex. So we have to do some pre-geophysical
13 survey work to understand that.

14 The next Presidio Trust issue is lead-based
15 paint in soil plan and the technical approach work plan
16 that was passed around at today's meeting and so is
17 great news for that's with the regulators. Now, that
18 was a really important document for Bob Boggs, so
19 hopefully it's in a shape that he comfortable with. And
20 you can take that to the next step. There will be
21 public comment period on that, so stay tuned for that
22 later on this summer.

23 I felt that the RAB would like a presentation
24 on the lead plan. Just let me know, and we can schedule
25 that in. Just tell Mark. You can give me agenda items

63

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 for the next RAB committee.

2 Next slide. Landfill E field investigation is
3 finished, and our contractors are taking a look at the
4 data that's coming in and crunching numbers, but we
5 asked them to stop any detailed report information at
6 this time. We realized that we need the RAB and the
7 State regulators to get up to date on the information
8 that was generated by last year's fill investigations,
9 so we have had a couple meetings to talk about those
10 data and materials. And so I basically have asked to
11 hold up and to stop work on the report until we get more
12 information back from the RAB. So, preferably, I would
13 like to get more information from Doug or Mark or any
14 RAB members on the data before we ask the consultant to
15 keep working on this. I was thinking maybe early or
16 mid-March, if you guys can get comments in.

17 MR. KERN: How about mid-March, or March 14th?
18 That should be fine with us.

19 MR. COOPER: 215 CERCLA site. All we found
20 was some petroleum contamination. We asked the
21 regulators to see if we can do the cleanup at the
22 building. That will be happening next month. A very
23 small dig. The cubic yards is 50 to 100 yards. We're
24 not too sure exactly, but not a large cleanup. But
25 there isn't any CERCLA hazardous substance that needs to

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 be cleaned up there.
2 Public Service Health Hospital: Nothing for
3 us to say there. We're crunching numbers.
4 One thing: I would like to extend an
5 opportunity to have another data review meeting with the
6 RAB on this before we issue a report. If you guys are
7 interested, talk to Mark yourselves. We could have that
8 at a RAB meeting or a special meeting.
9 The feasibility study. This has been a long
10 way in coming, and we are just about there. We've
11 gotten a releasing report based on NPS comments who have
12 given us an approval to release the report contingent on
13 fixing certain things, so we're just about there. I
14 truly expect that when we get this out in March -- this
15 will happen -- this will be an extremely exciting
16 document to get out on the street and to get regulatory
17 comments on and the RAB members. So these remedies are
18 a whole bunch of CERCLA sites. It's a thick document so
19 if the RAB would like us present an overview of the
20 highlights at a special meeting, let us know; and we
21 will be more than happy to do so.
22 That next slide is on the small-arms firing
23 ranges. This is a set of sites that are at the very
24 early stages of a CERCLA State remedial investigation
25 feasibility study. We are just starting to investigate

65

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 those sites. We've got the Park Service's concurrence
2 to release that plan to investigate those sites. That
3 will be mailed out to the regulatory agencies and the
4 RAB next week.
5 The petroleum plan that George just talked
6 about. And then two documents regarding our lead-based
7 soil and cleanup.
8 Just a final note: I talked about before that
9 we want to create a link on our environmental website.
10 So you can click on that and go to the place where you
11 can see correspondence and documents that are in
12 electronic format. We are very close to being able to
13 establish a link. There's a number of clearances that
14 it has to be cleared through. So the link has been
15 created and a mock-up has been created by Rich Miller,
16 our computer person. And once the link is approved, we
17 can start putting letters and correspondence into that
18 so you can see what's new. That's it.
19 MR. KERN: Any questions?
20 MR. SUTTER: On Landfill E, I believe you
21 mentioned that after the February 4th meeting there was
22 some information that they were going to get back to the
23 RAB on [inaudible]. I'm unclear on that.
24 MR. KERN: Probably the stability stuff.
25 MR. ANDERSON: Chris was going to send me a

66

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 spreadsheet with the map coordinates of the features on
2 the site -- wells, et cetera
3 MR. COOPER: I'll remind Chris about that.
4 MR. KERN: It was the geotechnical information

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

that he was still working on.

MR. SUTTER: Something about a volume analysis.

MR. YOUNGKIN: We talked a lot about that.

MR. COOPER: I don't think there was an action item on that. Chris and I took notes from the landfill meeting. And this was just kind of advice that we heard from the RAB that we heard as far as things to look for when you do your volume estimates. I put that into the notes.

MR. ANDERSON: I think there will be some clarification as to how the estimates that were in the report had been generated.

MR. COOPER: Exactly right. In my notes to make sure that all the assumptions are shown, all the calculations are shown. My notes also state that we were advised to try two different ways to calculate the estimates so we are not relying on one method and see how the two different methods compare with each other. I will take a look at my notes.

MR. YOUNGKIN: I will send that to everybody.

67

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

MR. KERN: Item No. 6 will be pretty fast. Jim?

Item 7, "New Business." Any new items to be considered?

The action items review, always a fun part. What do I have here tonight for our action items for the RAB? We're going to get a letter together for a couple of RAB members who will come and read the insurance policy. Request that opportunity. We are going to generate a list of questions for a future insurance policy meeting, and then you're going to arrange a meeting with those folks.

MR. COOPER: Right. And a presentation at either the February or March committee meeting.

MS. SIEGEL: At the committee meeting do we talk about those questions or have them before and then send them to somebody?

MR. KERN: I think one of the ways we can get it started, if anybody has any starter questions, is send them to everybody and then people can add to them and just build it up by e-mail. And, when we can, refine it at the meeting.

MS. SIEGEL: So we can be more informed about asking the people. So we should set that goal for two weeks?

68

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

MR. KERN: I think we should get it going right away. If anybody has questions that they know about, start compiling a list.

MS. CHEEVER: If we have a subcommittee, I nominate Dave to coordinate it.

MS. SIEGEL: Perhaps he could e-mail us. I want a deadline for action.

MR. COOPER: I'll recommend to do a presentation, a gentleman named Mike Plumley, who is a Marsh & McLennan broker. And this guy is extremely knowledgeable about the process. He briefed me on

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

12 them when I came on. I will ask him to assist me or
13 actually do the presentation, if that's all right.
14 Hopefully, he'll say yes, so I will call him immediately
15 to ask him about the February RAB meeting and do an
16 e-mail to the committee. Then I will need your
17 questions a lot sooner than March 1, obviously.
18 MR. SUTTER: Marsh & McLennan was the Trust's
19 broker that facilitated getting an insurance company on
20 board and getting your policies in place; is that
21 correct?
22 MR. COOPER: Correct. Yeah. In fact, they
23 still provide me with advice, like if an issue comes up
24 and I'm looking at the policy, I call Mike up.
25 MR. SUTTER: He's your broker?

69

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. FORD: Mike also worked for Zurich when
2 the policy was written. He was there at the beginning.
3 MR. COOPER: He just recently switched jobs
4 and now works for Marsh.
5 MR. KERN: For those of you who have
6 experience with them, I'm counting on you to generate
7 questions.
8 Moving on. Sending around e-mail questions.
9 Get that ready for Craig. I have March 14th for RAB
10 Landfill E comments, so start getting those together.
11 We are still waiting for geotechnical Landfill E data.
12 Those are the action items that I have. We'll
13 probably also look into what we need to do to prepare
14 for the Freedom of Information Act request, if we need
15 to do that.
16 MR. COOPER: That e-mail that I sent out last
17 month, if you could kind of add these new ones to this
18 list and track those that have already been done.
19 MS. SIEGEL: On the Landfill E meeting that I
20 didn't go to, by March 14th?
21 MR. COOPER: The set of data. It's a page of
22 data. It's that.
23 MS. TRIGIANI: You can probably send them that
24 top page, page 1.
25 MR. YOUNGKIN: There might be a meeting again

70

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 before March.
2 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah, the 25th.
3 MR. COOPER: We brought extra sets of the data
4 package to February 4; and I'll see if we can round up
5 two extra sets for George and Sarah.
6 MR. KERN: Agenda Item No. 9. What I have is
7 insurance policy presentation; and then we have the
8 petroleum program.
9 George, you mentioned maybe doing that next
10 time when Jim will be around.
11 Then lead-based paint program. We have the
12 choice of lead-based paint field study and the firing
13 ranges. So we are trying to prioritize and get you
14 something for the next meeting
15 Are there any announcements before we --
16 MS. CHEEVER: Well, actually, as you were sort
17 of saying, Chris offered us about four different
18 presentations, so I guess we'll decide which ones we

Presidio RAB Feb 11 2003.txt

19 want at the committee meeting
20 MR. KERN: If there is any presentation at the
21 moment. There are a lot of -- these are all priority
22 projects. We need to hear them all eventually.
23 MS. CHEEVER: Well, any that we don't have
24 actually presented at the committee meeting I would like
25 to have an item discussed at the committee meeting and
71

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 how soon.
2 MR. KERN: Any other items? All right. Then,
3 seeing none, thanks, everyone. Meeting adjourned.
4 [THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:33 P. M.]
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

1
2 Jerry Anderson
3 Sam Berman
4 Jan Blum
5 John Boudro
6 Craig Cooper, Presidio Trust
7 Tony Di Stefano, National Park Service
8 Dennis Downing
9 George Ford, Presidio Trust
10 Mark Frey, Presidio Trust
11 Joel Hermann
12 Doug Kern
13 Doug Leuckart
14 Jan Monaghan
15 George Pace
16 Sara Siegel
17 David Sutter
18 Brian Ullensvang, National Park Service
19 Tracy Wright
20 Mark Youngkin
21
22
23
24
25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICERS CLUB
BUILDING 50
THE PRESIDIO

March 11, 2003
7:00 p.m.

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

CLARK REPORTING
2161 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 201
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 486-0700

Freddie Reppond, Reporter

2

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:12 P.M.]

MR. KERN: Welcome to the regular meeting of the Restoration Advisory Board of the Presidio for March 2003. I'd like to welcome tonight the Presidio Trust and their contractors; the National Park Service, Tony, Brian; our regulatory community -- do I see Jim here this evening; the RAB community members. Thank you for being here tonight. Any members of the public, thank you very much for coming to our meeting and hopefully participate tonight.

Are there any additions, changes, modifications to tonight's agenda? Seeing none, we'll move ahead. Any announcements tonight?

MR. YOUNGKIN: I've received a letter from Dennis Downing requesting an eight-month leave of absence because of a job assignment. So I guess we kind of automatically approve those unless somebody objects or has strong feelings about it.

MR. O'HARA: Do we have a list of people interested in joining the Board that are not able to join because we are full?

MS. MONAGHAN: Yes.

MR. O'HARA: An eight-month leave of absence is awfully long for the work that we do each month. Four or five months, maybe six months pushes it. Eight

3

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

months is, I think, going outside the envelope. I move that we accept the resignation with regret.

MR. KERN: There's been a motion. Is there a second on the motion?

MR. SUTTER: How long has Dennis been a member of the Board?

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: Two years. Our normal
8 automatic leave of absence is three months.
9 MR. BOGGS: Since current membership is still
10 below what the charter says, could we add a person and
11 still allow him to come back in eight months or whatever
12 he's requested?
13 MR. YOUNGKIN: Yeah. That could be done
14 pretty easily.
15 MR. SUTTER: He can always reapply.
16 MR. YOUNGKIN: He can always reapply and
17 become a member again.
18 MS. BLUM: Are we having discussion on the
19 motion?
20 MR. KERN: I was waiting for a second. If we
21 don't have a second, we wouldn't have any discussion,
22 because there wouldn't be any motion.
23 MR. BERMAN: I second it.
24 MR. KERN: For purposes of discussion, one
25 thing that I think the charter says is three months. Is

4

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 that right?
2 MR. BERMAN: I think that's true.
3 MR. KERN: So we could accept a three-month
4 leave and then review it again in three months and grant
5 him another one in three months.
6 MR. YOUNGKIN: He seems to make it pretty
7 clear that he will be gone eight months.
8 MR. BERMAN: My only feeling about that, just
9 between you and me, is that we have a statement in the
10 charter; and unless there's really a good reason for
11 making something different then it sets a precedent that
12 the charter doesn't really mean much. And so I'm a
13 little -- I think people's lives are such that maybe
14 they can't be members for a certain period of time. But
15 it would seem to me that we could accommodate him by
16 saying that the charter allows for a three-month
17 absence, but we would welcome him very strongly when he
18 returns as a new member with prior involvement.
19 Something, a note, that would say something to the
20 effect that we really want him to come back so we don't
21 want to set a precedent that's not so vastly different
22 than the charter and at the same time there's no
23 compelling reason -- I would feel somewhat different if
24 he had major surgery and can't attend meetings because
25 he was going to be laid up in a hospital for eight

5

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 months. But this is a job assignment away; and
2 presumably he'll come back, but no one ever knows about
3 job assignments.
4 MS. CHEEVER: I'm reading from the charter,
5 and it says, "Additional leaves of absence for longer
6 periods must be requested in writing addressed to the
7 membership committee" -- something that Dennis has
8 essentially done -- "and shall only be granted if (1) a
9 majority of the membership committee votes to grant him
10 leave; and (2) at the next following RAB meeting a
11 majority of the community members votes to approve the
12 membership committee's recommendation." And then there
13 are certain conditions.

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

14 So I think maybe the motion is untimely and should go to
15 the membership committee first.
16 I think the leave of absence states that he can be
17 reinstated after his leave of absence as long as the
18 community membership is not at its maximum. So there's
19 that opening as well. Then that spot wouldn't be vacant
20 for purposes of voting.
21 You might ask him about it, too. He might have a real
22 definite feeling about it and settle it in two seconds.
23 MR. KERN: We have a request for an
24 eight-month leave. We have a motion on the floor. We
25 have a suggestion that it be put to the committee. So

6

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 sort of following the Roberts' Rules of Order, I guess
2 we need to deal with the motion and then we can deal
3 well whether we send it to the committee. Is there a
4 further discussion about denying his request and this
5 motion?
6 MR. O'HARA: I'd like to amend the motion
7 then. And that is to send this request for an
8 eight-month leave of absence to the committee and follow
9 procedures of the charter.
10 MR. SUTTER: Second that.
11 MR. KERN: Discussion? It's been moved and
12 seconded that we send Dennis's request for an
13 eight-month extension to the selection committee. All
14 in favor?
15 Opposed?
16 Motion carries.
17 Any other announcements? Old business? Recently
18 released documents? Do we have a list?
19 MR. COOPER: We will have to e-mail that out
20 to everybody, just as kind of a summary.
21 MR. KERN: Committee report?
22 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you. We had our
23 regularly scheduled planning meeting on the 25th of
24 February. It was a well-attended meeting, and we only
25 had one topic -- the environmental insurance policies.

7

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 We spent the entire meeting discussing the environmental
2 insurance policies. We were given a handout, quite an
3 extensive one, as well as a lot of PowerPoint slides. I
4 believe there were extra copies, so if anyone is
5 interested to get a handout from that you may be able to
6 get it from Chris.
7 MR. NELSON: I can send it out to whoever
8 wants one.
9 MR. YOUNGKIN: So if you couldn't attend the
10 meeting and you want to see what was presented by Mike
11 McMullen of Marsh & McLennan. He's a former employee of
12 Zurich; and he gave quite an extensive presentation on
13 the insurance policy and a lot of detail, maybe more
14 than that some members wanted. But we're all more
15 familiar with it and asked questions. So we need to
16 follow up on that. Dave is e-mailing around his
17 thoughts.
18 Did you send it to everybody or just me?
19 MR. SUTTER: I think I cc'd all the community
20 members.

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

21 MR. KERN: Dave expressed his feelings that he
22 believes that the Freedom of Information Act request
23 should go ahead and be filed. And I think some of the
24 other people felt that the presentation answered their
25 questions.

8

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 So as far as I know, that Freedom of Information Act is
2 sort of an individual filing, right? The RAB can't file
3 a Freedom of Information Act request, right? It would
4 be an individual on that.

5 MR. COOPER: You could sign it on behalf of
6 the RAB.

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: Or an individual could on
8 behalf of the RAB. Are there any feelings about whether
9 or not we should, as a group, file this FOIA request; or
10 should an individual go ahead and file it on his own
11 behalf?

12 MR. ANDERSON: Did the staff give any
13 indication of why the Trust feels this shouldn't be
14 released?

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: Yes, they did. There was legal
16 stuff. Karen, Joanne, Nicole of both the Trust and the
17 Park Service; and Mike McMullen.
18 You want to summarize what that was?

19 MR. COOPER: That's why I brought them.

20 MR. NELSON: A lot of it has to do with policy
21 and the finance structure.

22 MR. COOPER: It would be better for Sam. He
23 took notes.

24 MR. BERMAN: I think one of the reasons
25 they -- again, I'm not sure that I believe the word

9

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 "redacted" is proper. But it has been redefined for our
2 purposes, but we all understand what it means, so I'll
3 continue to use that word. But I think there were two
4 compelling reasons. One is that Zurich, I think, is
5 interested in expanding its business. This is what was
6 explained. I'm only the messenger, so don't kill me.
7 That Zurich is interested in taking this business to
8 other conversion sites; and there were certain aspects
9 and certain things in the policy of how the rates were
10 determined and certain aspects that would be real; some
11 business information about the way Zurich determined its
12 involvement and its financial commitments; and it was
13 felt that shouldn't be made public because it was felt
14 it was their private business to know those things.
15 There were also some parts that were redacted having to
16 do with the interactions with the Army. And this was
17 stated and I was confused with that because I thought
18 that was all over, but they still remain redacted.

19 MR. YOUNGKIN: Maybe because of the same
20 reasons they want to go to the Army again and write
21 another policy.

22 MR. BERMAN: My personal opinion: I thought
23 they were not unreasonable in asking that that part be
24 redacted. And I also am concerned about this whole
25 issue of -- another personal feeling -- in that we have

10

CLARK REPORTING
Page 4

1 a very cordial relationship with the Trust. And I feel
2 that, when you go after the Trust with a claim, there is
3 an element of contentiousness there. Personal feeling:
4 I don't like it. I think if an individual wants to do
5 it, that's their prerogative, but I would strongly feel
6 that the RAB should not jeopardize the cordial
7 relationship that we have with the Trust, because when
8 we didn't have cordial relationships, as we had with the
9 Army, and it was very difficult to get information and
10 get invited to meetings. They could invite us or not.
11 So there's a lot of things that I feel are important in
12 maintaining that. And my personal feeling is that we
13 can't do much about the insurance policy. There's some
14 pretty good reasons for redacting -- business reasons --
15 so I'm not feeling any strong reasons that the RAB
16 should be signators to any FOIA expedition.

17 MR. SUTTER: I just want to reiterate that my
18 recent e-mails indicated that my, quote, preliminary
19 recommendation, unquote, would be that a FOIA request be
20 filed. To be quite frank [inaudible] on the insurance
21 as well. I'm not making a final recommendation that the
22 RAB do that at this point. George is very knowledgeable
23 in insurance, and I am very interested in his thoughts
24 on the issues that I see of the policies and how the
25 Trust is going to potentially benefit, particularly

11

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 [inaudible] program going forward and if there are any
2 that might be covered by a stop-loss policy. Also,
3 there are crucial issues that are involved as to how
4 cost overruns are reported between the Trust and the
5 insurance company. That was information that currently
6 remains redacted. I think that's key to how effective
7 the insurance policy coverage will be as the remediation
8 program proceeds, and that kind of information, I
9 concede, has any business proprietary value. So, as I
10 mentioned in my last e-mail, I cannot comment
11 meaningfully analyze or comment on these policies
12 without being, quote, unredacted, unquote. And you
13 can't do anything about the original policies and
14 limits, but in the ongoing implementation of claims
15 under the policies, I think the RAB does have the
16 fiduciary responsibility to be aware of what the
17 procedures are and perhaps to assist the Trust in being
18 more effective and successful in potentially realizing
19 the insurance benefits that [inaudible] policy.
20 So that's my position. And I don't think it's a dead
21 issue. I think it's a very live issue and something
22 that the RAB should be involved with.

23 MR. KERN: Mary.

24 MS. TRIGIANI: Dave, do you feel -- I'm not
25 sure if the option is still on the table, but one or two

12

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 of us -- and I would think that would be you and
2 George -- would have permission under some sort of an
3 NDA to review the unredacted original document. From my
4 perspective, I would be satisfied if I knew you were
5 satisfied with the level of information -- the two of
6 you guys were satisfied and then you could advise us

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

7 accordingly. Is that an effective option for you?
8 Because I'm with Sam on this, and also the whole
9 bureaucratic aspects of the FOIA Act. Is that viable?

10 MR. SUTTER: It would be acceptable to me.
11 You may recall, Mary, that one of the Trust lawyers
12 stated that that procedure would only be established
13 subsequent to an FOIA request.

14 MS. TRIGIANI: Oh, I missed that point.

15 MR. SUTTER: I asked that specific question at
16 the meeting, and there was a response that "we will not
17 do that," make that administrative decision. To do that
18 we will have to file a FOIA request. Then possibly out
19 of that request, or negotiation relating to that
20 request, we could essentially establish that claim.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: I think the more that you and
22 George can narrow it down to just what section should be
23 released, instead of the whole document, that might make
24 it a whole lot easier for us to go through the FOIA
25 process rather than trying to do the whole thing. Just

13

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 say this section or those sections.

2 MR. SUTTER: I think George and I could
3 possibly come up with a priority list [inaudible]
4 I will offer one opinion. Rates and methods or
5 decisions on when to pay fall in the area of [inaudible]
6 funds as proprietary business practices. What's the
7 claim? How to adjudicate a claim? Whether or not the
8 additional insureds get paid as opposed to the Trust are
9 not defined. They are redacted and not proprietary and
10 should be of vital interest to the RAB, so in my mind
11 finding out that the Army and the Interior are
12 additional insureds sent up a red flag. And I think we
13 should file a request. In other words, not only do we
14 have this insurance policy, we don't know how we are going to
15 get paid, but somebody else might get paid instead of
16 the Trust.

17 MS. TRIGIANI: Are you guys satisfied that we
18 have gone as far as we can within the process of the
19 relationship between RAB and the Trust?
20 That's up to the Trust to respond to. The lawyers told
21 us that at the meeting.

22 MR. COOPER: That presentation was our attempt
23 to provide as much information as possible on both
24 policies and including the redacted sections in a public
25 forum. And the FOIA Act is your next option. I think

14

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Sam said it right, Jerry, as far as the reason. We've
2 been orally informed by Zurich that they would likely
3 claim confidential business information on some if not
4 all of the portions that are currently redacted. So
5 that's why we said, Let's try this presentation now
6 because that's something that we can put together
7 quickly and at least get that information and revisit
8 that. That goes for the new RAB members. And then the
9 FOIA will unfold as it shall. Maybe there's portions
10 that they decide -- so we get the FOIA. And then we
11 write a letter to Zurich saying, "We have a request
12 under the Act; is there any portion of this document
13 that you claim privileged?" And then they would have to

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

14 explain why if yes. There's that process. That's the
15 next step, basically, if you choose to take that.
16 MS. TRIGIANI: So there's no more talking to
17 the lawyers?
18 MR. COOPER: No, just through correspondence.
19 MR. DIES: Doug, I'd like to know if I'm the
20 only one who has never seen a redacted copy of the
21 insurance policy. I'd like to know how many people have
22 seen it recently. Four. So we're really talking about
23 something we do not know anything about. Wouldn't the
24 first step be to distribute the redacted copies to all
25 members of the RAB and then we come back and at least

15

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 have some intelligent assessment of whether we
2 individually feel that it's adequate or not.
3 MR. BERMAN: I'd like to declare a motion that
4 a committee be formed, or a subcommittee, of at least
5 two, including Dave and George, to examine this and read
6 it over and report back to us, as much as possible, what
7 they think should be asked for in the FOIA. And the
8 purpose of this motion is, in parentheses now, that we
9 will really have things that we need to spend our time
10 on that are important and timely. I'm looking at my own
11 time. I looked at the insurance policy, read it over
12 quickly. I don't know want to spend my time on that.
13 We have important issues; and if people have an infinite
14 amount of time, fine. But if there is a committee of
15 two that are technically skilled to read it, then we
16 should assign them or work on this and report back on
17 what portions of the insurance policy should be
18 requested through the FOIA process.
19 MR. DIES: I'll address this to Craig. I
20 would like to have a redacted copy of the insurance
21 policy.
22 MR. BERMAN: You could be a member of the
23 committee.
24 No. I want it for my own use. I don't want to be a
25 member of the committee. Thank you.

16

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. KERN: There's been a motion and a second?
2 Any discussion about having a committee of George and
3 Dave prepared to work on that? And, of course, other
4 folks would be welcome to join with them.
5 MS. CHEEVER: Sam, did you picture that
6 committee reporting back at our planning committee
7 meeting or at a RAB meeting?
8 MR. BERMAN: I would prefer that it be the
9 planning committee meeting. The purpose of the
10 committee is to have a more precise statement for the
11 FOIA because it's clearly part of the policy that they
12 are privileged; and there's a much greater chance of
13 getting some information if they're separated, as George
14 said. And so I think that the committee's work would be
15 devoted to going through the policies and specifying
16 what needs to come from the FOIA process, and they could
17 report it at the planning committee. I don't know if
18 this is part of the motion or not, but it's part of the
19 discussion.
20 MR. KERN: Any other discussion? It's been

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

21 moved and seconded that we form a committee of at least
22 George and David to report back to the RAB on what
23 should be requested in a FOIA act request.
24 All in favor, aye?
25 Opposed?

17

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Motion carries. If there are any other folks that would
2 like to join with George and Dave, they've been
3 volunteered by Sam to do this work. And we very much
4 appreciate your work.

5 MR. SUTTER: Is there anyone else who wants to
6 know everything they wanted to know about it? It's a
7 fascinating topic.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: I'll join you.

9 MR. KERN: Thank you.

10 MR. COOPER: Does anyone else want a copy of
11 the insurance policy redacted, while I'm making copies?

12 MR. KERN: Thank you to George and David and
13 Sam and Mark and those of you who join with them for
14 this important work. Is there any other committee
15 business or reports? Let's move on to 5-A, "Feasibility
16 Study Overview."

17 MR. COOPER: Chris Nelson and I are going to
18 do this first presentation in a tag-team approach. And,
19 as you know, the long-awaited Presidio Trust feasibility
20 study for the main installation sites is going to be
21 issued very shortly. And so we thought we would do a
22 presentation of this, basically, in two parts. This is
23 Part I. And then I guess at the April RAB meeting you
24 will hear Part II of this presentation.
25 So, Chris, do you want to take on the first slide?

18

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. NELSON: The way we structured this
2 presentation was to give veterans and newbies alike an
3 understanding of not only what this document is going to
4 contain in a general sense but also what a feasibility
5 study is, because I'm sure there are many veterans on
6 the RAB who haven't spent a lot of time reviewing
7 feasibility studies recently. I don't believe the Trust
8 has put one out since I've been here, so you probably
9 haven't looked at too many. Also, we just wanted to
10 sort of educate everybody on CERCLA and where the
11 feasibility study exists in the process, because, if you
12 look at this scale here of all the actions that take
13 place in the CERCLA process, it's the RIFS of the
14 feasibility study, where we are, is right in the middle
15 of it all. That's not to say that it's going to take
16 twice as long or half as long to get through. Some of
17 those sites will be done in a couple of years, some will
18 take many more, but we want to give you a basic overview
19 of the CERCLA process. At first, I'll just talk about
20 the general overview and take us up to the point where
21 we were discussing an RIFS. Craig is going to jump into
22 a discussion of specific things that a feasibility study
23 tries to accomplish and how it does that, specifically
24 in evaluating remedial alternatives and using the
25 Superfund or CERCLA IX evaluation criteria. So let's

19

CLARK REPORTING
Page 8

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 get started on the overview. I promise to be brief.
2 Some of you probably know the CERCLA process is a very
3 lengthy process that takes a long time. There are
4 something like almost 1300 sites on the NPL. That's
5 since about 1980, and I don't think that many have come
6 off the fund list. It's still going, so it's 23 years
7 almost of identifying and ranking sites and cleaning
8 them up.
9 So the first step that a site goes through in its
10 lifespan in CERCLA is that it gets identified. There
11 are a number of different ways that a site can be
12 identified. Somebody can call in a spill; there could
13 be a documented release at a site by a regulatory
14 agency; there could be an anonymous tip. And the EPA
15 calls this process "site discovery." A site is assigned
16 a Superfund or CERCLA ID number and it goes into a
17 database, known as CERCLIS, which is the CERCLA
18 information system. It's get tracked from there as to
19 information about where the site is for their
20 information.
21 From site discovery, the site goes through a preliminary
22 assessment. Sometimes it warrants a site inspection.
23 Those are basically just a first look at a site. And
24 EPA has a thick guidance document that tells you how to
25 conduct a CERCLA preliminary assessment. There are a

20

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 variety of factors that are evaluated at a site.
2 If the site appears to warrant some further attention
3 after the preliminary assessment you go on to a site
4 inspection, which generally involves taking a sample,
5 like soil or water. And essentially what you're trying
6 to do at this point is establish whether or not a
7 documented release has occurred to the environment.
8 The next step that happens is the hazard-ranking system,
9 which is a computer model that was generated by the EPA
10 to assist in listing sites on a national priority list.
11 The site goes through an evaluation of a variety of
12 environmental factors, waste characteristics of the
13 site, whether or not a release occurred, whether it
14 occurred to water, air, soil, et cetera. Then it looks
15 at targets like human beings, drinking water, fish,
16 people breathing air, sensitive species, et cetera. If
17 the site scores high enough it can be listed on a
18 national priority list. It gets a little tricky from
19 here, because there's a huge number of sites that go
20 through the CERCLA process every year in the PASI stage
21 in all the nine different regions. And EPA has to really
22 make a hard decisions, about whether or not a site is
23 eligible for NLP listing.
24 The first pass is, if it scores greater than 28.5 on the
25 HRS, it can be eligible, but there are a lot of

21

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 prioritizations that go on before the decision is made
2 to try and list a site.
3 So I'm going to talk about where the Presidio main
4 installation is in this time line, so just bear with me.
5 The next step, once the site is listed on the NPL, is to
6 conduct a remedial investigation feasibility study,

Page 9

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

7 which is basically trying to characterize the nature and
8 extent of contamination at the site, how much
9 contamination is present, whether there are actual risks
10 associated with that contamination. A risk assessment
11 is often done.
12 Then that takes us into the feasibility study, which is
13 where we are now. Once the RIFS is completed, a
14 proposed plan is put out. The proposed plan is
15 essentially a thin document that summarizes the
16 preferred remedial alternatives that are being put
17 forward by the Trust for the site that's going to be
18 cleaned up and what we propose to do about it.
19 Once the site gets through the proposed planning
20 process, there's a 30-day public comment period on that,
21 and we will move on to the record of decision or other
22 DTSC remedial action plan, which is what will be
23 prepared here. Most of us are familiar with those.
24 We've just completed one for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5.
25 We are currently working on a few others for sites that

22

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 are included in the feasibility study.
2 From there, we were sort of concurrently working on
3 remedial design at the same time as the remedial action
4 plan for Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. But you would take
5 the next step and do a remedial design and a remedial
6 action, which basically completes the bulk of the work
7 that entails remediation at the site. In the case of
8 Presidio sites, it's largely excavation and hauling away
9 waste. So once you get to remedial action, you're very
10 close to being done. What happens after that is your
11 groundwater monitoring, drinking water monitoring, surface
12 water monitoring, and maybe some sort of engineered
13 material or board institutional controls or whatever
14 that go in place at the site. Sites that are in that
15 phase right now are the Public Health Service Hospital
16 sites. And sites that are at site closure and site
17 certification are Crissy Field and the DEH in Area A.
18 So that long-winded explanation is the overview of the
19 CERCLA process.
20 Where we are now with the Trust feasibility study
21 [indicating] is this yellow highlighted area in remedial
22 investigation feasibility study for the main
23 investigation sites. Craig is going to take it from
24 here and discuss what it is in our RIFS and then the
25 nine criteria.

23

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Just one side note on what Chris
2 said. A site does not have to be on the EPA's national
3 priorities list to use the CERCLA process. For example,
4 the Presidio is not on the national priorities list, but
5 you can still use the CERCLA process to adjudicate
6 remedy decisions at a particular site, such as we're
7 doing.
8 So this main installation site RIFS has 39 sites in it
9 in total. We are going to describe them briefly in a
10 minute here. And except for Landfill E, which we agreed
11 in advance, that one does not have a recommended
12 alternative in this study. And Landfill 4 and Fill Site
13 5, because those really were taken out of the

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

14 feasibility study. I think they were mentioned and
15 then taken out, because the RAP that we wrote for those
16 two sites were special. But for all the rest of the 36,
17 there will be a -- you go through the whole feasibility
18 study process and a recommended alternative for the
19 sites, with a slight footnote on Fill Site 6, which we
20 will describe later on this evening. Okay.
21 First, you characterize the sites. As you'll see in the
22 latter part of the presentation, Chris is going to talk
23 about problems with that. I guess one of the biggest
24 problems is that a lot of folks felt that those sites
25 were not well characterized. There wasn't enough data.

24

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 There was too many data gaps. So that's one thing that
2 we did. We feel that we have not characterized the
3 sites.
4 The next step is risk assessment. And Bob and Brian,
5 correct me if I'm wrong, but in the way this is done the
6 way we are doing risk assignment at each of our
7 remediation sites is basically through the development
8 of cleanup levels. And there was a very elaborate
9 process of developing specific cleanup levels for soil,
10 sediment, and groundwater. And then we take our
11 characterization data for each site and compare it with
12 our cleanup levels. And generally if we have an
13 exceedence of cleanup levels, be it in soil or sediments
14 or groundwater, then that site is brought forward and
15 it's kept in the feasibility study, where it's warranted
16 for remedial action. Some type of remedy is necessary.
17 And for sites when you take a look at the
18 characterization data and compare it to cleanup levels
19 and there is not any significant exceedences, then
20 generally those sites are characterized as "no further
21 action sites." That's what the remedy would be. Those
22 sites don't constitute enough risk to warrant the
23 expenditure of money and cleanup action. So CERCLA is
24 really a risk-based type law that says you spend money
25 on sites that constitute sufficient risk and to bring

25

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 that risk down to an acceptable level. Basically, we
2 are following the federal process, but the state process
3 just goes hand-in-hand. We are doing this dual system.
4 We are kind of discussing the federal process, but the
5 state process is the same. We will talk about a few
6 caveats where we bring in the state process to make sure
7 that we're covering both federal and state law here.
8 That's a very important step. You'll see that some of
9 those sites of the 36 sites, because of the
10 characterization data, didn't have exceedence of cleanup
11 levels in a significant sense, so they got determined as
12 "no further action" sites. All the rest had been to be
13 brought forward and they needed remedial action. Before
14 you think through and just say, "Okay. Excavate this
15 one and this one," there's a process that you go through
16 for all those sites that need remedial action
17 objectives. And the first thing you do is come up with
18 these remedial action objectives. And that's basically
19 what you're trying to accomplish here. What are our
20 general goals here in our Presidio project and our

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

21 CERCLA program that we're trying to accomplish? I
22 think, for example, we want to protect human health, the
23 environment, comply with state laws. Those are generic
24 ones, but I think the Trust in general really has a
25 preference toward clean-closure-type remedies, because

26

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 it's a National Park and we really want to try to
2 restore our CERCLA sites and all of our sites as fully
3 and completely as possible, so it's consistent with our
4 future land use. And the land-use plan for Area B is
5 P-10, and the land-use plan for Area A is the GMPA, so
6 we take a look at those land-use plans and that plays an
7 important role in where are we trying to take our CERCLA
8 sites. So that's what remedial action objectives are.
9 So for each site, you then assemble and screen remedial
10 technologies, what kinds of technologies would work to
11 clean up the site. Then you assemble them into
12 alternatives. We're going to be using this term
13 "remedial alternatives" a lot. A remedial alternative
14 is nothing but a potential cleanup remedy for a site.
15 And for each site first you kind of develop -- you do
16 this big brainstorming. You could say for Fill Site 6,
17 what is the universe of all possible technologies that
18 you can come up with; and then you screen them down to a
19 smaller subset. Then you do a detailed analysis of the
20 subsets of alternatives, a comparative analysis, which
21 I'll talk about in more detail. Then you end up with
22 that preferred remedial action -- then the rest of this
23 got cut off -- to be carried forward in the proposed
24 plan and draft RAP. So you go through this screening
25 process and detailed analysis for sites that constitute

27

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 sufficient risk. You develop remedial alternatives,
2 screen them out, do a detailed analysis, compare them,
3 and then you come up with the recommended remedy.

4 MR. DIES: Is cost considered in any of this?

5 MR. COOPER: Absolutely. It's considered
6 twice.

7 And so those are the three steps of kind of a remedial
8 alternative evaluation process -- screening, detailed
9 analysis, comparative analysis.

10 The screening step -- there's three criteria we take a
11 look at just to kind of screen down and cut down on the
12 kind of a more out-there type alternative. Basically,
13 we take a look at three criteria: Effectiveness,
14 implementability, and cost.

15 Effectiveness is can it meet cleanup levels? Is it
16 protective of human health? Does it comply with state
17 laws?

18 Implementability: Is it feasible? Can it be done?

19 MS. SIEGEL: I understand the process. The
20 question I have is because none of the sites [inaudible]
21 is there anything like money that's available or
22 remedies that have to do with that that you have to go
23 to the state and do different rules click in
24 [inaudible]. How does the fact that you're going
25 through the CERCLA process jibe with the fact that none

28

CLARK REPORTING
Page 12

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 of the sites are actually on the NPL; or would there be
2 a more rigorous process for remedy money?

3 MR. COOPER: The fact that Presidio site is
4 not on the NPL has no effect on the way we are
5 conducting the RFS process.

6 MS. SIEGEL: Is money available that wouldn't
7 have been available [inaudible].

8 MR. COOPER: No. Yeah. The money is -- yeah.
9 Because this is a federal facility, even if it was on
10 the NPL, we couldn't go to the Superfund anyway. So if
11 gets on the NPL, it basically means the EPA is going to
12 be the lead regulatory agency. I don't know a lot of
13 the details on why the EPA chose not to list or if it
14 couldn't list. I don't know if EPA even tried to list.
15 I think a decision was made that EPA was going to hand
16 it off and therefore no reason to put on the NPL. But,
17 again, I wasn't around at that time.

18 MR. BERMAN: That was true at Hunters Point.

19 MR. COOPER: Hunters Point is on the NPL.
20 Just because EPA decides not to put a site on the NPL
21 does not mean it isn't risky or poses a risk. So
22 there's other reasons for either putting or not putting
23 a site on the NPL.

24 MS. TRIGIANI: Where is the time line of this
25 and the decision and the Zurich insurance relationship?

29

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: NPL listing versus Zurich?

2 MS. TRIGIANI: Yeah.

3 MR. COOPER: I think the decision with EPA to
4 hand it over to DTSC happened before --

5 MR. BOGGS: It happened at least 10 years ago.

6 MR. NELSON: We will walk through the process
7 of where this site is in relationship to all the other
8 sites in the Presidio program.

9 MR. COOPER: Now you get down basically to all
10 those sites that do constitute sufficient risk, because
11 you try to screen it down so you have maybe three or
12 four or five or six alternatives that you then carry
13 forward to the detailed analysis. And so in the
14 detailed analysis, this is where there are nine criteria
15 basically in the NCP. And I'll add where we tucked in
16 some state criteria also. So we have to look in detail
17 for each of these alternatives. So for Fill Site 6, we
18 take a look at Alternative No. 1: How does it protect
19 human health in the environment? How does it comply
20 with ARARs, and we've talked about that those are state
21 and federal requirements that would apply to that
22 remedy.

23 That's the first two. Then the next criteria are called
24 "balancing criteria." There are five of them. And you
25 can read them for yourself: Long-term effectiveness and

30

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 permanence, reduction of toxicity, mobility and volume,
2 through treatments. And the through treatment is a very
3 important caveat. You'll see that a lot of the
4 alternatives that we are considering are not pure
5 treatment alternatives the way EPA and CERCLA define
6 them. For example, excavation and offsite hauling is

Page 13

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

7 not a treatment alternative. You're just basically
8 picking up stuff and moving it and putting it down
9 someplace else. So that alternative would rank very low
10 for that criteria.
11 Short-term effectiveness. When you're conducting those
12 remedies what risks are posed to the workers and the
13 public in the short term.
14 Implementability. I talked about that. And cost. So
15 these criteria -- the balancing criteria -- that's
16 really where things happen. An alternative can compare
17 very poorly in one balancing criteria and do very well
18 on another and be selected. So there's a system of kind
19 of analyzing each alternative on this balancing
20 criteria.
21 Modifying criteria are state acceptance. State
22 acceptance is hugely important because we have -- that's
23 the caveat, that you will have a consent order with
24 DTSC. We're actually writing a RAP, which is equivalent
25 to the CERCLA decision document. But we need the State

31

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 to sign off on those RAPs to move forward under our
2 consent order.
3 Then community acceptance. And just briefly on that,
4 when you see the feasibility study, you'll see that the
5 feasibility study kind of made a prediction how each
6 alternative would fare with respect to that. But it's
7 truly a prediction, because, as we talked about before,
8 when the recommended alternative goes to the public for
9 comment, those two criteria are basically left blank
10 again, because you really officially analyze state
11 acceptance and community acceptance during the public
12 comment period.
13 After you've done this detailed analysis of each of the
14 alternatives, then you do a full comparative analysis.
15 You balance each alternative against each other and take
16 a look at the pros and cons of each one especially with
17 respect to the balancing criteria. And you're starting
18 to develop a rationale for what your preferred
19 alternative is.
20 And, last, the very last section of any feasibility
21 study is a recommended alternative. So you basically
22 have one recommended alternative per site. So in my
23 main installation feasibility study, we will have 36
24 recommended alternatives. And that recommended
25 alternative undergoes official public comment via the

32

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 proposed plan draft RAP stage. And you've kind of gone
2 through that process on Landfill 4/Fill Site 5.
3 Any questions on the feasibility study process?
4 Now, I'll hand it back to Chris to talk about the
5 history of our feasibility study

6 MR. NELSON: If anybody has any questions,
7 feel free to stop me at any time. This group of sites
8 that we're working on now started out in an Army
9 preliminary assessment that was completed and released
10 back in 1989, which was done by the United States Army
11 Hazardous Materials Agency. And it's quite an old
12 document and has quite a few records of inspections of
13 sites and interviews with employees and the like. And

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

14 their maps. As far as I know, this PA did not include
15 any of the typical CERCLA PA hazard-ranking system
16 factors that would have gone into a document at that
17 time. So it's basically just an initial look at sites
18 and sort of a screening of which sites warranted further
19 action. I'm assuming because there was never really a
20 site inspection done, it was probably around that time
21 the EPA and the Army and probably the State agreed that
22 an NPL listing probably wasn't going to be necessary,
23 because the next step was that they jumped right into an
24 additional remedial investigation, basically admitting
25 that there were sites that warranted remediation or

33

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 remedial action. And what normally would be following a
2 PA, as I mentioned before, would be a site inspection
3 and some field data. They started this remedial
4 investigation with field investigation in 1998. And not
5 to bash the Army but they were kind of stutter-stepping
6 along trying to get away with doing as little as
7 possible at every turn. As you can see from this slide,
8 from 1990 to '97, they actually worked on their remedial
9 investigation. Then also in 1997 they completed their
10 feasibility study for proposed remedies for a number of
11 sites, including the 39 installations. Now, think back
12 to the slide before where Craig was talking about
13 community acceptance and State acceptance. They may be
14 listed as a modifying criteria, but the Army's FS really
15 showed the power of State acceptance and community
16 acceptance because it was largely rejected by agencies
17 and the public. I believe 50 different organizations
18 and individuals wrote letters to the Army and DTSC,
19 including people sitting in this room, basically stating
20 that the Army's FS was not acceptable. The remedies
21 that the Army was putting forward largely relied on
22 long-term monitoring, leaving waste in place, not doing
23 a lot of cleanup. They were going to take about 30
24 years and was going to take a tremendous amount of money
25 and not really take anything away.

34

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 So that takes us to when the Trust came into being in
2 1996 by an act of Congress. In 1998, we were really
3 just getting started, I think, when Earl and Kolanowsky
4 [spelled phonetically] wrote the alternate remedial
5 actions document, which basically was the Trust's
6 official comment on the Army feasibility study. There
7 were probably about 10 people working here, maybe 12.
8 What that document did, it was the Trust's first stab at
9 saying this is what the Army is proposing as a bundle of
10 remedies for all these sites. We feel that they're not
11 really CERCLA-compliant. They don't really meet the
12 spirit of the CERCLA process. They did not propose
13 appropriate land use. They did not propose remedies
14 that were appropriate for a National Park. So one of
15 the things that we did in the agreement with the Army
16 and with the insurance companies and with the Park
17 Service was that we were going to revise the feasibility
18 study that was done by the Army. We also agreed in the
19 consent agreement, which Craig referred to earlier, that
20 we would revise the feasibility study. So along about

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

21 nearly exactly three years ago to this day, we presented
22 to the RAB our proposed approach to the study. And
23 that, through a lot of the things I'm going to tell you
24 about, that's what brings us to today.
25 As Craig mentioned earlier, the Trust's feasibility

35

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 study includes 39 sites. There were a number of other
2 sites in the FS that the Army put forth that got spun
3 out into other programs or into various advanced stages
4 of the CERCLA process, like the DEH site or Crissy
5 Field, which was going to be remediated very soon. That
6 was actually spun out because the original Army RIFS
7 looked at those sites. So those sites are not included
8 in this FS.

9 MR. BERMAN: On that point, can you make a
10 comment on what the logic was for including the 39
11 sites, because there's a number of other sites not
12 included [inaudible] in Area B that are not in the
13 feasibility study. So maybe you could comment on why
14 some sites were excluded.

15 MR. NELSON: I think part of it has to do with
16 the fact that some sites that were in the PA screened
17 out at that point. Other sites that have been
18 identified subsequent to the Army FS didn't even make it
19 into the PA, so they're sort of lagging behind. So it's
20 kind of inappropriate to include sites that haven't even
21 had an initial look in an RIFS process, so those sites
22 have been collectively lumped into another comparable
23 unit and which we intend to do an RIFS and probably site
24 inspections first to make sure we have some
25 contamination to address in another unit known as

36

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 "miscellaneous sites." [inaudible] study of records
2 review where we came up with something like 590 sites
3 that were evaluated. Are those the sites that you're
4 talking about?

5 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. And there's this famous
6 memo of Mark's which [inaudible] discussed. And it
7 puzzles me because I can see that they weren't in the
8 original Army PA. But at a given moment, they basically
9 started over again and could have included more things
10 in there because there's a number of these sites that
11 are much easier to deal with than, say, Landfill E. It
12 just puzzles me why historically we insisted on using
13 the Army's original PA that defined the RIFS and not
14 really going to a larger domain. Maybe there are some
15 practical reasons for it. I don't know if you want to
16 go into it, but it's a puzzle. There's not a clear
17 sense of logic and why some sites are out, other than
18 that weren't in the original PA.

19 MR. NELSON: A lot of the sites you're talking
20 are what, in the FS, we call miscellaneous sites.
21 They're buildings with some sort of suspected or known
22 contamination adjacent to them. They have not been
23 sufficiently investigated through any collection of
24 environmental samples whatsoever. Every single site in
25 the FS has had some sort of environmental sampling.

37

CLARK REPORTING
Page 16

1 Some of these sites, when the Trust started out in 2000,
2 some of the sites in the main installation had no
3 sampling. No groundwater sampling at Fill Site 5; we
4 did that. No sampling whatsoever at the [inaudible]
5 site. So we kept some of those sites in that appeared to
6 warrant further attention. Some of these other sites --
7 I wasn't around when that decision was made -- but based
8 on my experience of doing PAs and SIs and RIs under the
9 CERCLA process for most of my career, you just wouldn't
10 jump from a record of a bunch of sites that are
11 basically at the discovery phase and put them in an FS.
12 It's not done, because you don't have enough information
13 to carry them forward through that detailed analysis of
14 alternatives. So they are going to be addressed. We
15 are actually at something that's on the schedule and
16 we're looking at doing in the future. It's not
17 something that's going to get missed. This is a big
18 chunk of sites -- 39. We have to take these in as
19 manageable sites. I think through this CERCLA process
20 you're going to find some of those sites that you
21 mentioned that I said that were in Mark's memo are going
22 to survive and some are not.
23 Do you have anything to add to that, Brian?

MR. ULLESVANG: No, not really.

MR. NELSON: Does that answer your question?

38

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. BERMAN: More or less, but my comment is
2 that some of the outside sites -- outside the FS -- are
3 in the buildings around Fort Scott. Fort Scott is sort
4 of the jewel of the Presidio in some sense. So it seems
5 to me that you want to get those done right away and be
6 able to say that everything around Fort Scott is cleaned
7 up and ready for future use. It still puzzles me,
8 because they're not complicated. They are just
9 buildings. And so much other information-gathering that
10 you're doing anyway that has a special [inaudible] but
11 it's certainly a significant area with some very nice
12 [inaudible] for future use. And why that isn't part of
13 the FS [inaudible].

14 MR. NELSON: I know that Fort Scott is lagging
15 behind other areas in the Presidio in terms of land-use
16 planning, so the immediacy of having, for instance,
17 sites in Area A, which there are a lot of in the FS,
18 cleaned up first is important. Under our MOA with the
19 Park Service also, getting the Letterman site cleaned
20 up, which is actually [inaudible]. Those were higher
21 priorities in terms of land-use plans. Beyond that, I
22 can't add any additional information to that.
23 So one of the things we put forth in our work plan for
24 the feasibility study for the main installation sites
25 was that we wanted to improve and supplement the RI.

39

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 Like I mentioned a few minutes ago, there were many
2 sites that were poorly characterized or had no
3 characterization whatsoever. We conducted multiple
4 field investigations. The field data gaps, which is one
5 of the goals of a feasibility study, from August of
6 2000, we went out and did a large field effort. We did

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

7 another field effort in February of 2001, April of 2001.
8 We were back in the field in November of 2001. Finally,
9 the last work we did was at Landfill E this last
10 November. So we really filled a lot of data gaps that
11 existed and are in RIFS. We were also able to develop
12 site-specific cleanup levels, or may see them referred
13 to as "preliminary remediation goals" in the FS, and
14 also established background metals concentrations for
15 Presidio lithologies. And I want to point out that was
16 done in a collaborative process. The cleanup level
17 document -- that's kind of a stand-alone document that
18 the FS relies upon -- was a long process that spun out
19 of the Presidio main installation FS. Originally, it
20 was going to be a chapter in the FS; and we found that
21 it would be helpful make it a stand-alone document that
22 other units or programs can rely upon.
23 One of the other things that we wanted to do with our
24 study was propose an ARAR, or applicable or appropriate
25 requirements. We wanted remedies that were

40

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 ARAR-compliant. The Army's remedies, like I said, were
2 narrow at best. They weren't necessarily
3 ARAR-compliant. They didn't address the fact that the
4 site was a National Park and that a lot of waste was
5 going to be left in place, et cetera.
6 So, as a broad-brush overview of what's in the FS,
7 because it's going to be coming out very soon, I want to
8 walk you through some of the critical chapter, first,
9 identifying POCs, or potential chemicals of concern,
10 which was done in Chapter 4, and a very long discussion
11 of all the data set basically that was utilized for all
12 sites in the Presidio that were in the main installation
13 and how data was evaluated, and which chemical
14 concentrations were deemed to be spurious or which
15 concentrations were considered to be important and were
16 retained and carried forward in the FS. Like I
17 mentioned, there are applicable cleanup levels;
18 site-specific PRGs were done. That's outlined in
19 Chapter 5. That's a large repetition of some of the
20 critical chapters in the cleanup-level document. That
21 also discusses the methodology for calculating the
22 background metals concentration. It's important to note
23 that the goal is to clean up sites that have metals
24 contamination, but if sites have background
25 concentrations that appear to be elevated but are within

41

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 the range of the background, the goal is not to clean up
2 the background metals concentration. You would be
3 digging forever and digging up metals that are naturally
4 occurring.
5 Chapter 8 goes through the identification and screening
6 of potential remedial technology. That's sort of an
7 assembly of the screening of technologies, or the
8 screening of alternatives that Craig mentioned. The
9 three it has to pass are the EIC -- the effectiveness,
10 implementability, and cost. Then from there the sites
11 that pass that first screen are developed into remedial
12 alternatives, so Chapter 8 talks about process options.
13 It talks about what kinds of things would be applicable

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

14 or useful at the Presidio and which ones would not be.
15 For instance, spider remediation, soil washing, or
16 pumping and treating groundwater for 30 years. Those
17 sorts of things, given the nature of the sites and the
18 main installation, would not be appropriate.
19 Then, lastly, in Chapter 10, there's the detailed
20 analysis of remedial alternatives that Craig went into
21 great detail about in his presentation.
22 Any questions about what's in the FS?

23 MR. BERMAN: Does each chapter begin with a
24 paragraph or two summarizing the chapter?

25 MR. NELSON: There's an executive summary at
42

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 the beginning which lays out a map of the whole
2 document. Then, Section 2 provides a lot of background
3 about the whole cleanup program of the Presidio and the
4 whole conversion from the Army to a park. And it goes
5 through the history of where we are today with the FS.
6 Then there is an additional chapter that basically
7 summarizes a lot of the Army's actions up to this point.
8 And then Chapter 6 establishes a final list of chemicals
9 of concern. That's really what I call sort of the RI
10 part of it. That's the section that introduces and
11 gives site histories on all the sites and talks about
12 the media that are contaminated and, to the extent
13 feasible, the extent of the contamination, in which
14 areas of the site, which chemicals at the site are
15 considered a concern and will be facing these response
16 actions.

17 MR. BERMAN: But each chapter does not begin
18 with a short overview summarizing the chapter's
19 contents.

20 MR. NELSON: It just introduces very briefly
21 in the big scheme what the CERCLA process is supposed to
22 do, but it's not lengthy.

23 MR. BERMAN: The idea is that each chapter is
24 an entity to itself and the units.

25 MR. ULLESVANG: Sam, I don't think that each
43

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 chapter is really a stand-alone entity. Each one does
2 not have a short summary of the chapter at the front.
3 It just launches into what it is. You have the title
4 and maybe a sentence or two but nothing more than that.

5 MR. COOPER: We will prepare an executive
6 summary overall of the feasibility study that every RAB
7 member will receive.

8 MR. NELSON: I'm going to talk about that in a
9 minute.

10 I wanted to include a map that shows the location of all
11 the sites in the main installation. This one is
12 actually straight out of the FS. It also includes all
13 the operable units at the Presidio. An "operable unit"
14 is just a term that's used in the regulatory community
15 to define a group of sites or in some cases, you can
16 have one site where you have soil as Operable Unit I and
17 groundwater as Operable Unit II. At the Presidio,
18 operable units are basically defined either by
19 geographic areas or by names, like the main installation
20 is 39 sites. If you look at the brown spots on that

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

21 map, you can see that's spread through the site. You
22 have some in the southwest, some in the western portion,
23 the northern portion, the eastern portion, and a little
24 bit of the south. You'll see this map in the FS, and it
25 just shows where the sites are.

44

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 So what does this FS accomplish? I had a lot of time to
2 reflect on this, having spent several years working on
3 it. And we all as a team ought to be proud of what we
4 have done here. And I hope this document is well
5 received, because we are ready to hit the ground running
6 and move forward. But I kind of went through my notes
7 and looked at the FS and realized what we had done from
8 March of 2000 till now. As I mentioned before, we have
9 characterized [inaudible] on some 15 sites since August
10 of 2000. One of the big advantages of doing this FS and
11 for the future of the environmental cleanup program in
12 terms of our archival database and environmental data
13 was that we were able to take what the Army had done and
14 build upon the database of most sampling results from
15 the Army, not all, by any means. Some of it had to be
16 manually entered. And most of the past Trust
17 investigations lay a framework for our future samplings
18 that we do out here. So we will be able to utilize this
19 data in a number of ways as we move down the road to
20 help us make decisions about the Presidio. We have
21 helped to establish a Presidio-wide cleanup level
22 document which will be used in the decision documents
23 for main installation sites, also future decision
24 documents. And we have pushed 36 of the 39 sites closer
25 to remedial action by a proposed plan and a draft RAP.

45

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 As I mentioned and as Craig mentioned, Landfill E and
2 Fill Site 5 and Landfill 4 are not in that part of the
3 FS.
4 So what's the FS going to look like when you see it?
5 It's two volumes, one about that thick and the other one
6 is about that thick. 12 chapters. Admitted, the 11th
7 chapter is really a table and has a very small amount of
8 text. Then the 12th chapter is a lot of references that
9 were utilized. There's over 300 tables; more than 80
10 different figures; 5 different appendices, including a
11 chemical database and cost estimates for the remedial
12 alternatives for each of the sites. The 39 main
13 installation sites at the Presidio consist of 11
14 landfills. Or you'll also see the term "disturbed area"
15 or "graded area." They're all being treated as
16 landfills for purposes of evaluation in the FS. And 28
17 miscellaneous sites, which are essentially buildings or
18 small areas with soil contamination.
19 The document is broken down in certain chapters and then
20 in the appendices it's broken down by the NPS GNPA
21 planning areas. And that was done because the FS really
22 followed on EKI's remedial action document. That
23 document was divided that way. We did not start the
24 P-10 process until well after the FS was organized, so
25 we decided to keep it organized by GNPA planning areas.

46

CLARK REPORTING
Page 20

1 And throughout the document you'll see history and
2 identification of all the sites, discussions of
3 investigations, and summaries of the nature and extent
4 of contamination as well as which chemicals at the sites
5 have been retained for remedial actions and which have
6 been screened out.

7 Any questions?

8 MR. SUTTER: Who is putting this document
9 together, EKI?

10 MR. NELSON: Yes. The last iteration of it
11 came to Brian and myself to review in December of last
12 year. And we have reviewed it and gone back and forth a
13 few times on revising it. So basically it's now in
14 their hands. They'll be sending it to the printers next
15 week or maybe the end of this week, so it should be
16 coming out by the end of next week, I think.

17 What else is in the feasibility study? We mention
18 ARARs. These are the laws and regulations that apply to
19 the various proposed remedies to the FS. There's a
20 chapter on that. This is kind of putting it in lay
21 terms. These really apply to specific chapters, but
22 rather than using fancy terms like "assembling remedial
23 technologies" and "alternatives analysis," we're just
24 kind of saying we looked at remediation sites; we found
25 some that were useful for moving forward into a more

47

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 detailed analysis of those, and some were not retained.
2 Then in the end, Chapter 11, you'll see which
3 alternatives were proposed for the sites. And, again,
4 in the detailed analysis, as Craig mentioned, there's
5 sort of a prediction that the community is going to
6 accept these remedies and the State will accept these
7 remedies that will be eventually defined later on.

8 MR. BERMAN: In your feedback from EKI, has
9 there been any involvement with DTSC and the Water
10 Board?

11 MR. NELSON: Well, yeah. As we produced the
12 document over many years, the first step was getting an
13 approach approved, which was the work plan in 2000. So
14 the DTSC and the Regional Board approved the work plan
15 every step of the way that we have gone forward with
16 proposing things like cleanup levels and sampling events
17 and sampling results. Those have all been reviewed by
18 RAB and the agencies. And we even cheated a little bit
19 a couple of years ago and talked about potential
20 remedies in the summer and fall of 2000. We have not
21 really swayed too far from that. Two of those sites are
22 already being cleaned up. And one is off the table for
23 the time being. But we feel pretty confident that what
24 we're proposing is a strong package of remedies that
25 will be accepted, certainly not without comment or not

48

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 without questions. But we feel pretty strongly about
2 the document.

3 MR. BERMAN: But in this last period of time
4 with some of the crucial feedback between the Trust and
5 EKI were the two agencies involved in any of that?

6 MR. NELSON: No, the agencies looked at the

7 ARAR section. They have commented on that. The
8 agencies have looked at Chapter 5, which is essentially
9 cleanup level. They commented on that. They proposed
10 final cleanup levels that are being carried forth in the
11 document. So what hasn't been approved or we have not
12 got feedback on is the remediation alternatives that we
13 are proposing. But I don't think there's going to be
14 lots of surprises on the part of the agency as to what
15 we are proposing.
16 So the next step in the process is actually to get the
17 document out. I was talking to EKI. We're going to be
18 able to get all the final text changes done this week
19 and probably be able to get it in the normal recipients'
20 hands by the end of next week. Now, I specifically went
21 out of my way to ask for extra copies. And for those of
22 you who would like a full version of the FS, please let
23 me know. And in addition to that, we were also going to
24 produce and release an executive summary package, which
25 will really be helpful if you just want to know what

49

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 we're proposing and what's it going to cost. It will
2 basically be an executive summary, a table of the
3 remedies, the remedial alternatives that we are
4 proposing for those sites, and the costs associated with
5 those remedies. Then there will be a figure not unlike
6 that one, which shows where the different sites are.
7 MS. MONAGHAN: Will that be available on a CD?
8 MR. NELSON: We can probably manage that, but
9 the executive summary won't be very large.
10 MS. MONAGHAN: Will it be at local libraries?
11 MR. COOPER: The entire FS? Just the Presidio
12 library.
13 MR. BERMAN: Did you say it will be on CD?
14 MR. NELSON: We could have a CD of the
15 executive summary. That remains to be seen whether we
16 will. It's pretty big. It would be considerable
17 expense to get it all imaged on file. We'll look into
18 it and what it will cost.
19 As Craig mentioned earlier in his presentation, Part II
20 of presenting the FS is talking about the proposed
21 remedies. We don't think it's appropriate to say at
22 this point, and it will take quite a while. We will
23 talk about that at the next meeting, assuming we did not
24 see any objections from the regulators in the audience
25 here.

50

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 And then from there, the sites that are going to be
2 moving forward into the next RAP. We will be preparing
3 a proposed plan fact sheet and getting the next RAP
4 going for these sites so we can put them on schedule for
5 cleanup. So that's everything I have to say unless --
6 MR. BERMAN: Would you venture to give us what
7 the sum total cost was?
8 MR. NELSON: It doesn't include Landfill E;
9 and it doesn't include 4 and 5, so it's not -- I want to
10 say somewhere in the range of 40-some-odd million.
11 MR. ULLESVANG: Sounds about right.
12 MR. NELSON: Fifteen sites were proposed with
13 no correction, and even some of those have remedial

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

14 costs associated with them.
15 MS. WRIGHT: Two comments. First of all, that
16 was one of the best presentations I've seen in a few
17 years as far as the CERCLA overview and the history of
18 this process, so thank you. And if there's any chance
19 we can get a little cleaner version of this, I'd like to
20 get a copy, because I'm having a hard time reading it.
21 The second thing was I remember last time we had, in
22 addition to the executive summary and the table and the
23 remedies, we also had maybe two or three just to
24 circulate. So that would be -- I know you said if
25 anybody wants their own. It's a big document. To save

51

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 paper -- I'm not trying to tell people they shouldn't
2 get their own version -- but if it's okay with the RAB
3 that if we could share copies of these. Unless anybody
4 really objects, it worked out pretty well the last time
5 or two just to have maybe two or three extra versions so
6 we don't have to circulate and take turns and maybe lose
7 them.

8 MR. NELSON: The normal distribution for
9 documents, including libraries, agencies, and the RAB,
10 is like 11 copies. I think we'll get double that.
11 Everybody on the RAB will receive an executive summary.

12 MR. BERMAN: Isn't everything on the computer
13 anyway? I don't see what the trouble is in producing a
14 couple of CDs.

15 MR. ULLESVANG: I think the problem I've seen
16 is the compiling. The document will be physically
17 assembled from a variety of different files. And in
18 some cases, imaging some of the Excel spreadsheets,
19 which were built up of background tables, is difficult.

20 MR. BERMAN: Anything that's on Excel can be
21 put immediately onto a CD.

22 MR. ULLESVANG: It has been challenging.

23 MR. KERN: Are there any other comments on
24 this subject for Chris and Craig right now?
25 Thank you very much, Chris and Craig, for that overview

52

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 presentation on the feasibility study.
2 We are going to take break now for about 10 minutes and
3 come back for Landfill 4/Fill Site 5.

4 [A BREAK WAS TAKEN FROM 8:40 P.M. TO 8:52 P.M.]

5 MR. KERN: Starting up again. I guess we're
6 going to hand it back to Craig for some more updates on
7 various projects.

8 MR. COOPER: Right. I'll talk about where we
9 are on Landfill 4/Fill Site 5 briefly. Those first
10 slides were prepared by George Ford, who couldn't make
11 it tonight.

12 As everybody knows, Landfill 4 excavation is complete.
13 We've got the soil confirmation samples in that says
14 that the surface soils are clean. We are now putting in
15 the irrigation system to plant the eucalyptus trees that
16 are actually going in.

17 And Fill Site 5, our contractor is still busy digging
18 there. We sent out an e-mail. We found something new.
19 We keep finding things. Okay. We discovered an
20 underground storage tank at Fill Site 5. And I think we

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

21 found that a couple weeks ago when we started to dig
22 into Fill Site 5, we uncovered an area of
23 petroleum-contaminated soil, but we didn't know what the
24 source was. And so we dug a little more; and we found
25 an underground storage tank. Now, we still don't know

53

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 exactly what the source of that petroleum-contaminated
2 soil is. Is it overflows and spills released from this
3 tank or is it -- there's a petroleum site just across
4 the street called 1349. The jury is still out on what
5 the source is, but, as we continue to dig, we are taking
6 out this tank soon, later this week. And as we continue
7 to dig in that area where the petroleum is, we'll find
8 out if the contamination is localized, came from the
9 tank, or is it a more widespread problem? And then it
10 could be a spillover from 1349.

11 We have scheduled the City to come out, because we are
12 kind of time critical here. So we made an urgent
13 request because we were in the middle of a landfill and
14 didn't have time to wait for them to schedule an
15 appointment. What we also found was a building slab,
16 the foundation of a building that the Army had there.
17 And we believe it was a radar training --

18 MR. NELSON: Former Building 1351.

19 MR. COOPER: So that's why there was an
20 underground storage tank there. It was supporting that
21 former radar training station.

22 MS. TRIGIANI: Is this radar station a news
23 flash? Did we not know that it was there?

24 MR. ULLESVANG: We knew there was a building
25 there. It had not been researched enough to appreciate

54

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 whether there was petroleum tank associated with it or
2 not.

3 MS. TRIGIANI: I'm just curious. They did not
4 tell us it was a radar station?

5 MR. ULLESVANG: It was a building that was
6 used for radar training. We knew that. The building
7 was not a surprise.

8 MR. BOGGS: The tank was a surprise, even
9 though we had a drawing of radar-school building.

10 MR. COOPER: These are some slides taken by
11 George of Landfill 4. Look how nice and sweet it is
12 now. We are putting in compost and the irrigation
13 system.

14 MR. SUTTER: Have there been any other
15 surprises?

16 MR. COOPER: Other than our previous updates,
17 we found those ammunition blanks. We found another
18 unknown object that turned out to be a battery.

19 Everything else has been pretty -- Fill Site 5, aside
20 from the petroleum, has turned out to be the less
21 hazardous waste. And it appears that there's not so
22 much of it. And there's a lot of tree stumps and
23 greenwaste that's even cheaper to dispose of.

24 MR. SUTTER: So the classification pretty much
25 follows the initial sampling and analysis?

55

CLARK REPORTING

Page 24

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Yes. Once we do those trenches,
2 and then it goes from there, right.
3 MR. YOUNGKIN: How much smaller do you think
4 the volume is going to be?
5 MR. COOPER: No prediction until it's done.
6 Once that last truck leaves, we'll add it up and tell
7 everybody the volume that was removed from Fill Site 5
8 and how much that cost us. Any other questions on those
9 projects?
10 MR. DISTEFANO: Just to address Dave's
11 question of anything unexpected. One thing is not so
12 much hazardous waste as the serpentine being over there.
13 It wasn't how some had predicted it would be. It was a
14 little less than had originally been thought.
15 MR. COOPER: Right. We were thinking it was
16 going to be maybe half dune and half serpentine. In
17 different types of plant communities, plants grow in
18 these different soil types. And it turned out to be
19 less serpentine and less dune.
20 MR. FREY: It turned out to be a subset of
21 Colma, which is sandstone-derived soils.
22 MR. COOPER: That's Mark Frey, who's in charge
23 of the replanting and revegetation of Fill Site 5, so I
24 think he's probably a little disappointed that there's
25 not as much serpentine and dune, but I'm sure he'll make

56

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 it look really nice anyway with the Colma, eventually.
2 All right. Next RAP. Moving on. We have more
3 landfills to dig up, as you know. Before we can dig up
4 landfills we got to get a RAP in place. So our next
5 one, as we've talked about, is Baker Beach Disturbed
6 Areas 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6. We are now calling that
7 "A." That's new information I need to share with you
8 guys today. Let me get right into the new information
9 part and we'll talk about where the RAP is and how we're
10 doing. This is the most important thing to Craig Cooper
11 for the year 2003.
12 What happened is Fill Site 6 is a very large site and is
13 over here. And, interestingly enough, there's a
14 petroleum corrective active site called the 1065 study
15 area, which you probably know about. Part of it
16 overlaps this section of 1065 corrective action study
17 area, which is in this zone here. So this part of Fill
18 Site 6 is inside the Building 1065 corrective action
19 study area. Well, as you know, late last year, the
20 petroleum team went out and filled some data gaps for
21 this study area, so they took samples around various
22 sources. And that data just came in very late last
23 year. That data report has just been issued. We got
24 some hits in this zone right here that the petroleum
25 people could not correlate directly necessarily with a

57

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 petroleum source. So we are -- most of the hits are
2 lead. We got some lead and maybe some low-level pH's.
3 MR. ULLESVANG: There's some petroleum
4 products in there too.
5 MR. COOPER: And some petroleum products. But
6 the contractor that was doing this felt that, at least

Page 25

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

7 from their initial assessment, they couldn't necessarily
8 connect it to a petroleum release. It still might be.
9 It's new information that could be associated with Fill
10 Site 6 that the feasibility study process had not taken
11 into account. To keep the process going, we decided to
12 cut Fill Site 6 into two pieces. So Fill Site 6-A,
13 which the RAP will have a remedy for, will be this
14 section right here. It's that section between Girard
15 and Halleck where the low-level PCBs were found. It's
16 in the Tennessee Hollow area. That section is kept in
17 the RAP and retained for a remedy. And because we
18 needed to salvage what we could from Fill Site 6 -- and
19 that was the most important section. And the remaining
20 portion, the part with the new data, the Army has
21 actually characterized this section over here and it
22 came in less than cleanup levels, but both of these
23 sections, which we're now calling Fill Site 6-B is
24 betting pushed to a subsequent RAP, so we are not
25 forgetting about it, but it will just have to be a

58

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 remedy decision that will be made later for that
2 portion.

3 MS. TRIGIANI: B is the easternmost portion,
4 correct?

5 MR. COOPER: Yeah.

6 MR. DIES: I think George said there was a
7 Caltrans remedy for a new off-ramp. Does that affect
8 this area?

9 MR. COOPER: The ramp coming off Doyle Drive?
10 I don't know exactly.

11 MR. ULLESVANG: It's not a significant impact.
12 It's not like 207 where the Caltrans alignment goes
13 right through the middle of the site. So there may be
14 some peripheral issues but not nearly to the extent of
15 207.

16 MR. COOPER: It's not going to affect our
17 remedy for 6-A, and that's what's important for this
18 year.

19 The feasibility study that Chris and I talked about,
20 you'll see, when you flip to Fill Site 6, when you get
21 the document, that we kind of talk about in the initial
22 chapters we talk about all of Fill Site 6, but when we
23 talk about the data we say in early 2003 we found
24 potential new information about Fill Site 6, so we
25 bifurcated it into two sections. And we've only kept

59

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Fill Site 6-A to get the alternatives analysis in the
2 feasibility study. So Fill Site 6-B does not have an
3 alternatives analysis in the feasibility study. So it's
4 kind of in the same category now as Landfill E, as a
5 site that is in the feasibility study but with no remedy
6 recommendation at this time. So when you think of
7 Landfill E, also think of Fill Site 6-B. They're in the
8 same category.

9 The schedule is something very important to me. So the
10 RAP is something very near and dear to my heart since I
11 have the more recent draft. I have personally
12 rewritten this myself. And Brian is now taking a look
13 at my rewrite of the RAP, so hopefully we will get that

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

14 going, because our schedule is to have the draft
15 RAP/proposed plan out on the street, I would say, in a
16 couple months and start the public comment period in the
17 summer sometime, just kind of like we did on Landfill 4
18 and Fill Site 5.
19 I also would like to announce that we started -- George
20 has sent an e-mail to our procurement folks and saying,
21 okay, it's time to start turning the wheels again to get
22 that process going. So we are starting to write that
23 and the remedial design process that has to be finished
24 so we can have contractors bid on something. So it is
25 full steam ahead on all aspects of Baker Beach 3, 4, and

60

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Fill Site 6-A with respect to the RAP, the design, and
2 the procurement process.
3 Our schedule right now for actual excavation of those
4 three sites is in the fall. And we just pedal as fast
5 as we can.
6 Time permitting, I have a short presentation. I know I
7 am really verbose. I just want to tell people that
8 there's a document out for the public that's being
9 released publicly. It's our Presidio-wide lead-based
10 paint in soil plan and technical work plan. And I have
11 copies of it here. And this is what the plan looks
12 like. And, basically, it's the Trust's overall strategy
13 on how to clean up and address all of the contaminated
14 soil around buildings in the Presidio due to lead-based
15 paint that has either fallen on the ground due to the
16 painting process, historically; or, more likely, paint
17 that's chipped and peeled from exterior walls and then
18 fallen on the grounds around buildings. So these two
19 plans basically set up the Trust's strategy on how we
20 characterize these sites and how we clean up these
21 sites. It has a really nice tracking table. If you
22 want to look anywhere, go to Table 1 of the plan and it
23 lists all 770 buildings in the Presidio that are on our
24 strategy; and it shows where those buildings are as far
25 as cleanup. So it's sets up goals for us at the

61

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Presidio Trust to characterize a certain number of sites
2 per year, and hopefully to do remedies.
3 Our cleanup levels are right out of the cleanup level
4 document. Most buildings are in the residential area.
5 And, by the way, the recreational cleanup level for lead
6 is 500, but we decided to not even use that at all. We
7 went straight down to 400 for any building or lead site
8 that's in a residential or recreational area not to
9 exceed 370. And then a few of our building are actually
10 in eco sites. And we use our eco numbers for those
11 sites, so nothing surprising there. That's right out of
12 our cleanup levels document. What this plan does, it
13 groups all those 770 sites into different categories and
14 into either no-further-action, so those are sites that
15 after we tested them there wasn't any exceedence of those
16 cleanup levels or they've been remediated. As you can
17 see, only 10 sites have actually been completely
18 remediated without any lingering questions. So that's
19 no-further-action sites. Then there's these other group
20 of sites called "awaiting characterization." Those are

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

21 the ones that either haven't been tested, so the ones
22 that haven't yet been tested. There's 503 of those
23 sites. And then there are some sites that have not been
24 remediated, so we need to take some additional
25 confirmation samples because the way the Trust did some

62

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 lead-based paint cleanup in the past isn't consistent
2 with the way our plan says now. So we have to go back
3 and check some of those sites to make sure that have
4 been cleaned up. But we need to double-check to make
5 sure that they were actually consistent with the way we
6 want to do things now.
7 Then, finally, the last kind of grouping of sites is
8 "awaiting mediation sites." And those are sites that
9 have been characterized; they need cleanup. And there's
10 already 106 sites in the queue for that.
11 So awaiting characterization sites, again, are the ones
12 that need to be tested. After we test them, they get
13 recharacterized into two different categories. They can
14 become a no-further-action site or they go into awaiting
15 remediation site if cleanup levels are exceeded. And if
16 you want to know the details of how we characterize a
17 site, like how many samples per linear foot do we take,
18 that's explained in the technical work plan.
19 Then for the awaiting remediation sites, our remedy that
20 we are recommending is a full excavation of all
21 contaminant soil, outside disposal, confirm that our
22 cleanup levels have been met. And then, only if we are
23 not able to meet all of our cleanup levels because of
24 physical constraints -- it's gone under the building
25 foundation and it's just not feasible to get under there

63

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 or it's under a sidewalk or whatever -- that anytime
2 cleanup levels are not fully achieved then we would
3 apply a land use control for just that section of the
4 site where we could not get all the contamination out.
5 And how the land-use control process works is explained
6 in the lead plan.

7 As far as where this plan is going, this will eventually
8 undergo public comment also. But basically we're
9 getting preliminary comments. We got some preliminary
10 comments from Bob before we kind of go to the next step.

11 MS. BLUM: Would you really go to the effort
12 of doing land-use control for a sidewalk? Or really for
13 a building or something?

14 MR. COOPER: I think we really don't do that.
15 That's not the goal. It's really if you dig -- and it's
16 just doesn't make sense to go after this remaining part.
17 So that is just a reality that sometimes you face. But
18 the remedy is dig-and-haul with the use of land-use
19 controls only if there's physical constraints.

20 Briefly, to tell you where we are, we definitely need to
21 expedite our site characterization and cleanup work. As
22 you can see from the 500 sites that still need
23 characterization and the already 100 sites already in
24 the queue for remediation, we have got a lot of work to
25 do; and from our insurance presentation of two weeks

64

CLARK REPORTING
Page 28

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 ago, we know that the sooner the better on this. So
2 what we are going to do right now -- Anita Larson, by
3 the way, on my staff; she's the person from the Trust
4 who actually manages the Trust's lead-in-soil
5 remediation program. So what she's been doing in the
6 past, to do characterization and to do remediation, is
7 to do individual procurement. So if she wants to
8 characterize a site, then she would individually procure
9 that. It was very time-consuming and not very
10 efficient. So what we're doing now is actually that we
11 have an RFP out on the street that we want to have soil
12 remediation contractors that specialize in this type of
13 remediation bid on. So we'll have at least three or
14 four contractors on standby to go out and do work on
15 kind of indefinite quantity-type contracts. So only
16 using that way will we meet our goals of characterizing
17 50 sites a year and cleaning up of at least 25.
18 Also, what is a big challenge for us is to stay in touch
19 and in coordination with other Trust departments -- the
20 real estate and department of the Presidio Trust and
21 operations -- they have a whole building rehab program
22 that goes on that fixes up buildings and lease them out
23 to tenants. So we have to coordinate with that program
24 and keep up with them and lead and soil remediation
25 around that. And it's very important that, before we do

65

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 the lead-in-soil cleanup, that we stabilize the
2 exterior walls of all the buildings and do lead paint
3 stabilization painting of those walls so the soil
4 doesn't get recontaminated. That's very important and a
5 difficult thing for us because the funds for
6 stabilization painting of exterior walls does not come
7 out of the remediation program. That comes out of the
8 Trust's general budget. And so what I'm telling them is
9 that I want to do 50 cleanups a year; can you do 50
10 lead-based-paint stabilizations a year to keep up with
11 me? So that's an ongoing discussion.
12 All right. Then just a couple pictures. Building 910
13 on Funston was a cleanup that we actually had to do the
14 digging by hand, because we're in an archeological --
15 that's another coordination issue that we have to do for
16 a lot of buildings that are in sensitivity zones for
17 archeology. And what we had to do is dig it out. Then
18 we had a sifting process and a screening operation to
19 look for any artifacts that could have been found around
20 the building. We just most recently did a cleanup
21 around Building 516, which was actually in an eco site
22 so we did clean that up to eco levels.

23 MR. ANDERSON: Have the expenditures for
24 lead-based-paint removal been approved by the insurance
25 company?

66

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Yeah.

2 MR. ANDERSON: I suppose every time you do a
3 removal, you have to go to them again.

4 MR. COOPER: In the insurance policy, if you
5 take a look at Table 1, you'll see that lead-based-paint
6 cleanup levels are called an "insurance product." And,

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

so far, automatically preapproved. Certain number of sites per plan area are automatically preapproved. Yeah.

MR. BERMAN: What's your estimate of the total cost of the lead-based cleanup?

MR. COOPER: If you look in that --

MR. NELSON: \$7 million.

MR. COOPER: Is it seven? All right. Thank you.

MR. KERN: Thanks, Craig.

Any questions for Craig on the update?

Let's go to Item 6. Bob, do you have anything for us?

MR. BOGGS: I had mentioned two months ago that there was a change order for Landfill 4, that the waste was coming up Cal-hazardous. And we were talking about resampling that material. We procured the samples that were actually sent to the labs. We had leftover samples, so I had them analyzed at our State laboratory where I work. Essentially, they came with up with

67

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

identical results. In fact, the far majority of this material is soluble. Basically, they came out within ten percent of what their lab came up with, so basically we confirmed that everything is fine.

I followed up with some other people in the area.

Apparently, it's a good chance that the source of this is when lead-based paint becomes very aged the materials that hold it together start to fall apart. Then this lead becomes leachable. A lot of times, when we look at sites that have chips that have fallen, you can see the chips in the top of the soil. They don't come out quite as soluble because it's still bound in the paint. But very old materials, like those which are probably in this landfill, eventually that paint part breaks down and then the lead is easily solubilized by the test. So that's pretty much what we figure.

MR. COOPER: So this old lead-based paint can be in almost any landfill?

MR. BOGGS: Apparently, it's pretty prevalent in many places throughout San Francisco. There was a problem where, basically, 1906 earthquake rubble -- a lot of the buildings were painted with lead-based paint back then. It's old enough that it's broken down to become soluble now.

MR. COOPER: Getting back to the Presidio for

68

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

landfills, we might want to look at the disposal history to see if it was like the Army used in the old days we might have a higher likelihood of running into this problem.

MR. BOGGS: It's mostly for disposal or disposition concerns, so that you will have to do the SPLC versus the totals. Basically, on risk assessment they use a conservative estimate for the result that is bio-available, so that figure you're going to get is the total. So it's a much smaller number by the way the test is run. For example, if you had a sample with 50 parts per million as a total, if you run the wet on it and it's all soluble, it's going come up five.

RAB MAR 11 2003.txt

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: If this lead makes such a big
15 difference in the cost of the actions, why don't the
16 consultants recommend more wet testing up front in the
17 investigations. Tell us about that. It seems like a
18 disconnect there. It's a big cost factor, but it
19 doesn't really get analyzed up front.
20 MR. BOGGS: There's actually a number of
21 factors. I've seen it historically throughout the
22 industry. The people that go investigate the sites, the
23 geologists and soil scientists, aren't taking care of
24 remedies for remedies and disposals. They're just
25 characterizing sites. A lot of times, when we used to

69

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 write feasibility studies to evaluate whether you can
2 treat this soil in some way, there's certain things
3 you'd want them to look at. But geologists are thinking
4 one thing without taking all these later considerations
5 into affect.

6 MR. COOPER: We are just looking at totals
7 when we are assessing risk and compliance with cleanup
8 levels and whether a site needs to have remedial action
9 or not. We only take a look at this wet testing once
10 we've selected excavation.

11 MR. BERMAN: A technical question: If it's
12 soluble, is there a process you could develop where you
13 could leach it out and most of the soil would remain
14 clean?

15 MR. COOPER: Have a little onsite process?
16 MR. BOGGS: There are soil-washing
17 technologies. They generally are very difficult and
18 marginal in their effectiveness and tend to be fairly
19 expensive. It's a potential alternative that should be
20 considered, but it's not as easily implemented as most
21 people would think. There's a lot of treatability
22 studies that need to be done, because once you mix this
23 with water how do you dispose of the water? How do you
24 take that stuff out of the water along with the dirt and
25 everything unless you're leaching water or washing

70

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 water. They're generally very expensive processes.

2 MR. BERMAN: If this was a major problem with
3 a larger landfill, then it becomes an economic question
4 of whether you want to build a little on-site treatment
5 plant versus hauling it off.

6 MR. ULLESVANG: Sam, the converse of that on
7 the same idea, you can make it less soluble. Then it's
8 an easier treatment then removing it. And so that's one
9 of the things that they will have to look at. Sometimes
10 that can be done much more economically than washing it.

11 MR. BOGGS: Yeah. Probably 10 to 1 in washing
12 it, it's the stabilization part.

13 MR. BERMAN: That could also be done with an
14 on-site treatment plant. So if it's a major problem
15 there's another cost and engineering cost analysis that
16 might be considered.

17 MR. KERN: Anything else, Craig?

18 MR. COOPER: That's it.

19 MR. KERN: New business? Action items that I
20 have: We sent the eight-month leave issue for Dennis to

21 RAB MAR 11 2003.txt
22 committee. We've requested three or four additional
23 copies of the feasibility study for circulation. Those
24 are the action items I have tonight.
25 MR. NELSON: I got a bunch of action items.
Can I get a show of hands on the number of people that

71

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 didn't like our photograph-based presentation? And
2 that's fine. How many people would like me to mail a
3 cleaner version of that presentation? [A show of hands
4 was made, and names were taken.]
5 MS. TRIGIANI: It was such a great
6 presentation.
7 MR. KERN: Any other action items?
8 Announcements before we close tonight? Our next RAB
9 committee meeting will be March 25th.
10 Thank you everybody for coming out tonight. I
11 appreciate your participation. Meeting adjourned.
12 [MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:36 P.M.]
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

72

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700
MEMBERS PRESENT

1
2 Jerry Anderson
3 Sam Berman
4 Jan Blum
5 Craig Cooper, Presidio Trust
6 George Ford, Presidio Trust
7 Mark Frey, Presidio Trust
8 Joel Hermann
9 Doug Kern
10 Peter O'Hara
11 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Quality Control Board
12 Sara Siegel
13 David Sutter
14 Mary Trigiani
15 Brian Ullensvang, National Park Service
16 Tracy Wright
17 Mark Youngkin
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

RAB April 8 2003.txt

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICERS CLUB
BUILDING 50
THE PRESIDIO

April 8, 2003
7:00 p.m.

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

CLARK REPORTING
2161 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 201
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 486-0700

Freddie Reppond, Reporter

2

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:04 P.M.]

MR. KERN: Good evening, everyone. This is the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory board, June 2003. And it's a momentous occasion, because this is the beginning of the tenth year of the Restoration Advisory Board. This is the anniversary meeting. Hopefully, it won't last another ten years. So welcome to the Presidio Trust and their contractors, National Park Service; our regulators. We missed you at the last meeting. Good to see you here tonight. Community members. We have several new ones who are getting ratcheted up to speed with lots of new information. And any members of the public who are here tonight, thank you for coming out. I've received word from a couple of our members that they are out ill tonight -- David and Julie. And so I want to send them all of our best wishes for getting well rapidly.

Does everyone have an agenda? Any additions or changes? Paragraph any announcements? old business? Recently released documents?

One thing that just got released today is the data gap investigation work plan for Building 207-231 study area, which is a petroleum corrective action

3

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

planning site.

The main installation feasibility study is another one. And I think that should cover it, but I'll send out an e-mail to everyone if there are any others.

MR. KERN: Committee business and reports. Mark was away for our planning committee report. Was

RAB April 8 2003.txt

7 there anyone that was there that would like to report on
8 it? Well, I guess I'll step in and if anyone would like
9 to add anything, please do.

10 Chris Nelson gave a are very nice overview of
11 the feasibility study document which he had handed out.
12 We went through it basically chapter by chapter of what
13 was in it. And we had discussions along the way of
14 various kinds of what was contained in the document.
15 After that, which lasted a good hour and a half or more,
16 we then divided up into our formal working groups, the
17 four watershed working groups that we had some years ago
18 and reinstituted those. We have people now working -- a
19 Tennessee Hollow Watershed working group, the Fort Scott
20 and Lobos Creek. As yet, we don't have a CoAstal bluffs
21 working group,, but we might down the road. So those
22 are in place. And the Tennessee Hollow working group
23 did meet. And Craig joined us and Brian joined us. It
24 was a nice meeting at Mary's house. We should have Mary
25 reporting on it.

4

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Is there anyone who would like to say a couple
2 words? Jan, would you like to say something?

3 MS. BLUM: Well, the food was actually
4 wonderful. We walked through the nature sites in the
5 Tennessee Hollow corridor and talked about ways that we
6 thought we could make them all feasible for cleanup.
7 And I think it remains to be seen whether the strategy
8 that we discussed will work, but we're going to work on
9 looking at the cost of cleanup pretty carefully and
10 seeing if we feel like it's accurate for those sites
11 that are recommended at a certain dollar level and
12 perhaps put some on the side so we can clean up Fill
13 Site E properly, or the way that we would really like
14 to, because it's such a big site and such an important
15 site. We are planning to meet again, I believe, at
16 least that was the tentative discussion. And at that
17 next meeting, for which everyone will be are welcome --
18 we need to decide what date it will be -- we plan to
19 have read through some of this material about those
20 specific locations in Tennessee Hollow and come up with
21 some specific ideas that we can put into a document. In
22 the meantime, we'll be e-mailing around our various
23 thoughts to try to gel those.

24 MR. KERN: Julie mentioned to me on the phone
25 today that the Lobos Creek working group would be

5

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 getting together.

2 Sam, do you have anything to report on the
3 Fort Scott group?

4 MR. BERMAN: Sara and I have met. We're
5 looking at this area. It's kind of interesting when you
6 view the costs for full cleanup. There is no simple
7 association between cost for, say, when you have an
8 estimate of the number of cubic yards of the material
9 that has to be removed and you look through the whole FS
10 document and see if there's any relationship between the
11 numbers given for the cost of cleanup and the actual
12 volume. There doesn't seem to be any very tight
13 relationship. One of the things that requires, I guess,

RAB April 8 2003.txt

14 a more detailed look, say, if you look the coastal
15 bluffs area, it might be more difficult to do cleanup
16 there, whereas in Landfill 2 maybe that's also
17 difficult, but I found it -- I was trying to see, as a
18 first cut, to get some commonality between some of the
19 numbers to try to get a feeling for it. So relating it
20 to the volume that's going to be removed doesn't look
21 like a way to go. So I think, as a suggestion to others
22 who are looking at this, it's not a simple way. You've
23 got to really get into the nitty-gritty to understand
24 the numbers.

25 In the Fort Scott area, there's a number of

6

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 buildings where there's basically no further action
2 recommended. And, of course, it's interesting, in a few
3 cases there's words mentioned like "organics are
4 suspected," but there's no clear statement about whether
5 they really exist. And so I guess that's the reason for
6 the no-action that's recommended. And, of course, in
7 Fort Scott there is -- in that area is the famous
8 discovery of the carbon tet without any source thus far
9 discovered. There is no excavation of any kind
10 recommended in the Fort Scott. That's all various
11 after-the-fact monitoring.

12 MR. KERN: There's no alternative in the
13 document and feasibility study for an excavation
14 alternative.

15 MR. BERMAN: Yes. I think there is, but
16 that's not the recommended one. Oh, yes. Several have
17 been suggested, but the recommended one is monitoring.
18 And if you look at the net sum of at all monitoring
19 costs it's a little under two million. Almost half of
20 that is the monitoring involved in the Fort Scott area.
21 So the major monitoring expense is in the Fort Scott
22 area; and that's for the large field that's been
23 trenched in looking for the carbon tet. So I think
24 their recommendation was to cover it and monitoring.
25 But that particular area stands out to be quite

7

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 different than almost all the of other FS somewhere.
2 It's either no-action and it's pretty clear or there's
3 clean closure recommended. But here is this big
4 monitoring exercise involved there. So it's one that I
5 think I'd like to get a better understanding of why it
6 didn't go without clean closure; but I think it comes
7 down to money. You look at the present value for the
8 monitoring. It's a lot cheaper than it is to do the
9 clean closure. So there are some preliminary comments.
10 Hopefully, as we grasp this thing a little bit better,
11 we might have more to say.

12 MS. SIEGEL: We haven't talked, but one of the
13 things that I was going to ask Sam about later is the
14 issue of whether the soil excavation at the site is the
15 recommended process. I didn't have any sense. For the
16 most part, it was lead in the soil but not always. Even
17 when there was lead in the soil for excavation, I didn't
18 have a sense of the size or amount or the degree of
19 contamination. Chris once mentioned for those hazardous
20 materials that need to go to a Class I landfill that

RAB April 8 2003.txt

will was a price per ton. I think it was \$80 per ton, I can't remember. Whatever it was, it was a good one.

MR. COOPER: For a volume of Class I or Class II?

MS. SIEGEL: No. If it's Class I then you

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

have that amount, what it costs to take it to the landfill. But where it was soil excavation, the prices were all over the map. And since I don't have a sense of the size, I didn't know whether it was related to size or how those numbers --

MR. ULLESVANG: The easiest way is in Volume II of the feasibility study. Usually, the first page of the cost of each of those alternatives will tell you how much volume is being excavated; and there will be a price per cubic yard for that excavation.

MS. SIEGEL: Whether it's lead-contaminated soil or whatever?

MR. ULLESVANG: There's a price to excavate it, so you can see how much volume of soil is to be removed. Sometimes it's in tons. Sometimes it's by yards. Depending on unit cost, some things are paid by ton. Some things are paid by volume. And then for the disposal sites you can identify easily the assumptions that were made using that same process.

MS. SIEGEL: Sam, does that answer your first question?

MR. BERMAN: Well, in part, but sometimes there is no -- even in the cases where it looks like all Class II, it's still not a simple formula between the volume and the capital cost.

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

MR. ULLESVANG: No. And there is some interest when you break it down and just take the total volume by the totally price and get that number. It is all over the board. Some are very expensive per cubic yard and some very much less expensive. Part of that is because there's a lot of costs that are not volume-driven but getting work plans together costs a similar amount for a smaller site than a larger site. But you can use your price per ton to kind of see what the average is and then those sites that are much more or much less you can understand why they're different than the others.

MR. BERMAN: Right. My comment about the monitoring the Battery Howe-Wagner area and the other estimate for clean closure was so much more expensive that it looked like that alternative -- the recommended alternative was certainly the most cost efficient, but it greatly depended on the volume associated with clean closure for Battery Howe-Wagner. And what I couldn't find in the first-cut reading is what went into that volumetric estimate in there. And if it's actually in there in some detail I just didn't find it. That's why I was looking for a common denominator. I said, okay, if you had a rough figure and there's a number given for Battery Howe-Wagner is the clean closure is that the one

CLARK REPORTING
Page 4

1 that is so much more expensive than the monitoring, but
2 it's based on a volume that's -- it's just a volume
3 that's given -- the geometric volume is given in Volume
4 II, but there's no detail of how that volume was
5 determined.

6 MR. ULLESVANG: As I recall, there is a little
7 bit of discussion of that, I believe, in Chapter 6,
8 where they talk about the plan area. One of the first
9 of those areas of excavation, but I don't recall if
10 there is any detailed presentation for that particular
11 site.

12 MR. KERN: What I'd like to do, if we can, is
13 not focus on Battery Howe-Wagner at the moment, but
14 you've raised a number of good points. I've got a lot
15 of your questions. And maybe we can share those
16 questions with Craig and set up a meeting prior to a
17 committee meeting, which is what I'd like all the
18 working groups to come up with, is a working draft of
19 their comments. Maybe in the next couple of weeks maybe
20 we can get with Craig and talk about some of those
21 questions.

22 MR. COOPER: Right. That's a great idea. I
23 think at the small meetings that's where we can really
24 have more time to get into the details. But if you have
25 easy questions like that maybe the group leader from

11

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 each of the watershed groups can e-mail Chris and I
2 those questions so we can at least take a look and
3 e-mail back in advance or questions like that. The
4 bigger-pictures ones you can save for the face-to-face
5 discussion at the meetings.

6 Is there a Lobos Creek watershed group
7 represented? Because Chris prepared and copied out
8 excerpts from the FS that are related to the Lobos Creek
9 sites.

10 MR. KERN: Julie would be the one that should
11 receive that. She requested that.

12 MR. COOPER: I'll just mail it to her.

13 MR. KERN: Okay. There was a meeting today
14 designing for Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 3 and 4. I'll
15 save some comments for that.

16 Then, at the end of our planning committee
17 meeting, we had a membership committee meeting to talk
18 about Dennis Downing's request, which had been put off
19 to committee. And somebody that was there could report.

20 Tracy, would you like to comment on what we
21 decided for Dennis?

22 MS. WRIGHT: We discussed his proposal, which
23 was, I believe to have an eight-month leave of absence
24 for business reasons, I believe, for business travel.
25 And we decided to grant that. It seemed a reasonable

12

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 request, and I believe we had confirmation put in

2 MR. KERN: It seemed the right thing to do.

3 MS. WRIGHT: I don't know whether he
4 responded.

5 MR. KERN: He did. He thanked us for that.
6 But I should also say it's the committee's

RAB April 8 2003.txt

7 recommendation to the RAB that that be granted. We
8 discussed it for 15 or 20 minutes. That's what we would
9 recommend to this group, but I think we actually have to
10 take a vote.

11 MS. WRIGHT: Some of the reasons we talked
12 about. He's been fairly active in his time on the RAB.
13 It takes a lot of time to get new members up to speed.
14 He's offered a lot, and he seems genuinely interested in
15 the issues. So these looked like pretty good qualities
16 of a member.

17 Does anyone else want to add anything else to
18 that?

19 MR. KERN: One issue was did we have extra
20 slots that were available that by having Dennis be away
21 for a long time that we wouldn't allow someone else to
22 have that membership position. And Dennis is also
23 concerned about that. I think we're at about 21 or 22,
24 and we can have as many as 30. So there didn't seem to
25 be an immediate need for his slot. So those were some

13

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 of the reasons that that was the recommendation.

2

3 MR. YOUNGKIN: You need A motion?

4 MR. KERN: I need a motion.

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: I move.

6 MR. KERN: Do I hear a second?

7 MS. BLUM: Second.

8 MR. KERN: Would there be any discussion?

9 MR. BERMAN: I just have a question. I'm sure
10 you discussed this -- and maybe it's not even
11 appropriate, but this has never been done before, right?
12 On a leave of that long?

13 MR. KERN: I think that's correct.

14 MR. BERMAN: So this then sets a sort of
15 precedent of some sort.

16 MR. YOUNGKIN: No. I believe we actually did
17 grant Arlene a one-year leave of absence.

18 MR. KERN: That's right.

19 MR. YOUNGKIN: And then she never came back.
20 Took a medical leave of absence.

21 But you're right, Sam. I think that's a good
22 point. Are you concerned that it might send a message
23 that it's fine to leave for as long as you want?

24 MR. BERMAN: Well, I just bring it up as a
25 discussion. It could be that in order just to -- maybe

14

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 in the bylaws it should be looked at carefully as an
2 amendment to the bylaws be made or some recommendations.
3 It's become a little more clear-cut so it's really not
4 an ad hoc procedure. But we really have something that
5 is completely clear on the leave of absences.

6 MS. WRIGHT: Even like the conditions for
7 granting them?

8 MR. BERMAN: Right.

9 MR. KERN: I guess I would only say I would
10 differ with you that it was in an ad hoc way that it was
11 dealt with. I think we did send it to committee from
12 the full RAB meeting and the reasons were discussed.
13 And it seemed the reasons were appropriate for Dennis in

14 that particular case. Now, I think we could all
15 probably come up with a scenario that would seem not
16 appropriate, so my feeling was bylaws were designed to
17 give us some discretion to that group. Perhaps we can
18 later bring up would the group play favorites. So
19 perhaps that would be valid. I would agree on that
20 basis. So, if you like, we could have somebody review
21 that. But I guess I would at least like to take care of
22 the motion that is on the floor if there's no further
23 discussion. Is there any further discussion?
24 So all in favor of granting Dennis's
25 eight-month leave, aye.

15

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Opposed?
2 That carries unanimously. Thank you.
3 Any other committee business reports?
4 MS. BLUM: I wish to follow that up a little
5 bit farther. I think Sam brings up a good point.
6 Sometimes we may grant a leave of absence, and maybe we
7 won't. So I think there should be some clarity around
8 the rule, but I'm happy to work with somebody on that.
9 MR. KERN: Okay.
10 MR. O'HARA: May I suggest that, if you're
11 interested in working on that, that you include Julian
12 because he was prominent in doing a draft of the bylaws.
13 MR. KERN: Yes.
14 MR. O'HARA: And he is an attorney --
15 MS. BLUM: I'd be happy to work with Julian on
16 this. I'd be happy to work on his team.
17 MR. O'HARA: Just because he wrote the
18 bylaws -- or his committee. And he has a background on
19 this kind of structure, and he is an attorney, and that
20 would certainly be worth discussing with him.
21 MS. BLUM: Do you want me to contact him, or
22 would you like to contact him, since he should be
23 allowed to have the lead, since he's the author.
24 MR. KERN: I think it would be good to review
25 it and have the two of you involved.

16

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MS. BLUM: Should I contact him.
2 MR. KERN: Thank would be great.
3 MR. YOUNGKIN: Julian has already expressed an
4 interest in reviewing the bylaws and just fine-tuning a
5 few sections that seem to be a little ambiguous. It
6 wouldn't be a rewriting of the bylaws but just
7 fine-tuning, I guess you would say.
8 MR. KERN: Okay.
9 Any other community business or reports?
10 Let's go on with 5-A
11 MR. COOPER: Actually, I have two
12 announcements: A site tour and a deadline for articles
13 for "Cleanup News." I don't know if that counts as
14 announcements or new busyness.
15 Anna has a brief announcement regarding the
16 upcoming site tour.
17 MS. HATHAWAY: The tour will be on April 15th,
18 4:00 in the afternoon. And I believe the people who are
19 attending will be Mary Trigiani, Sara, Gloria, John, and
20 George. Anybody else?

RAB April 8 2003.txt

21 MR. COOPER: Announcement No. 2 is -- I need
22 to announce this because -- it's regarding our next
23 "Cleanup News" newsletter, which is going to be in the
24 June Presidio Post, and the deadline for articles is
25 early May, before the next RAB meeting. I think it's

17

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 May 9th.
2 Okay. Now, on Agenda Item 5-A, about the
3 feasibility study for the main installation sites. At
4 the last RAB meeting, Chris Nelson and I presented part
5 one a-two-part discussion of feasibility studies at the
6 Presidio remediation sites. And last month we talked
7 about had are feasibility studies, what do they consist
8 of. We talked about that they're based on the CERCLA
9 law. And CERCLA is a-risk-based-type law that mandates
10 the cleanup of hazardous substances. And it's about
11 spending money where there's sufficient risk, and you
12 clean up to bring risks down to an acceptable level.
13 And that's kind of what the CERCLA law is about. And
14 the feasibility study fits in the process. It's for
15 those sites where there is sufficient risk. Then the
16 feasibility study analyzes the alternatives site by site
17 to try to figure out what's the best cleanup strategy or
18 what's the best alternative to address the risk that is
19 posed by each site. That was part one last month.

20 Because we hadn't quite released the
21 feasibility study, we couldn't talk about what the Trust
22 feasibility study had recommended for each site. Now we
23 are here ready to talk about what we're recommending in
24 the feasibility study.

25 So I recapped what we talked about last time.

18

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Then what I listed and described are the Trust
2 feasibility study's recommended remedies broken into
3 four main categories. We'll talk about that. And
4 because you chose to analyze the feasibility study by
5 watersheds, this presentation will review the
6 feasibility studies by planning area. I kind of broke
7 up the discussion by watersheds to give the committees a
8 way to follow along. We'll also talk a little bit about
9 costing for each one. I know that's an important issue
10 for everybody, probably an ongoing issue that we'll
11 continue to track

12 To recap again what's been going on, recently.
13 Again, we talked about it a little bit last month. It
14 actually was mailed out to everybody, to the
15 stakeholders on March 17th. Just as Mark Youngkin
16 talked about, there was a general discussion of the FS
17 as a breakout in the RAB watershed working groups at the
18 committee meeting on March 25th. Then there was a
19 Tennessee Hollow watershed subcommittee on April 1st at
20 Mary's house.

21 So we did distribute five copies of the FS to
22 the RAB. The CD-ROM version is coming out very soon,
23 next week. Chris says it's looking really good. It's
24 going to have hyperlinks and you'll be able to negotiate
25 the entire document all very easily. So stay tuned for

19

CLARK REPORTING
Page 8

RAB April 8 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 that. We can burn copies of that.

2 We now have an executive summary of the FS for
3 those that don't want to get into the ten inches of the
4 feasibility study. The executive summary is a good
5 overview of what the feasibility study is recommending.

6 What is the Trust's feasibility study
7 recommending? We are recommending four different types
8 of remedies for these sites. They would be broken up
9 into "no further action"; "clean closure" -- that's to
10 excavate and move all the contaminated material away and
11 recycle as practical off-site disposal. Then there's
12 "remedy action discussion deferred." There's two sites
13 where we couldn't actually recommend a remedy yet. And
14 then Category IV is just "monitoring and land-use
15 control site." That's the Battery Howe-Wagner site that
16 Sam was talking about. So those are the four basic
17 categories of sites that remedies fall into.

18 I'll briefly describe each of those four
19 categories. And, again, this forum not a really good
20 way to get into the details, but I'll give you a little
21 bird's-eye view of what the Trust was thinking about.
22 Each category leaves it up to the committees to get into
23 any great detail.

24 On the "no further action" sites -- there are
25 15 of them. Twelve of them, basically, it's no

20

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 exceedence; there's really no COC's. That means that
2 there weren't any contaminants that were above cleanup
3 levels or background. Sometimes on metals it's a little
4 tricky to try to do that, but for basically on 12 of the
5 15 it was pretty clear that there weren't any sufficient
6 contaminants there.

7 At 3 of the 15 sites we struggled a little bit
8 more. There's a long story that I'll save for the
9 committee meetings, but basically at 3 of them, that's
10 at Graded Area 9, Building 680, and Buildings 1151 and
11 1153. Those sites actually had either a pesticide hit
12 or a PCB hit that was above the acceptable cleanup
13 levels for those sites. But after really wrestling with
14 those sites and trying to figure out what the right
15 thing to do was, the Trust believed the detections just
16 didn't constitute sufficient risk to carry forward for
17 any remedial action. And when you read the FS you can
18 see we tried to take a look at that and we did some
19 statistics on the data and to compare it to different
20 types of not only the cleanup levels but different ways
21 to try to apply the cleanup levels to receptors that
22 we're trying to protect at each of these sites. So I
23 wanted to point those sites out.

24 Just as a side note on Building 680, on two
25 sites we are recommending "no further action." Even

21

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 though it looks like they have a little bit of
2 exceedence, they actually had cleanups before. So now
3 the question is, Should we do additional cleanup at
4 these sites? Because now cleanup levels have now
5 dropped down lower since the Army did a cleanup of these
6 sites in 1998, and now we have new cleanup levels.

RAB April 8 2003.txt

7 Next slide gives you an overview for those
8 folks working in each of the committees about where the
9 "no further action" sites are distributed per watershed.
10 So you can see that Fort Scott has four; Tennessee
11 Hollow has six; Coastal Bluffs, zero; and Lobos Creek,
12 five. So I'm sure we'll be talking a lot more about the
13 "no further action" sites in each of the committees for
14 the cleanup closure sites. These are sites that clearly
15 had contaminants above cleanup levels so we had to do an
16 alternative analysis for them in the FS. And we felt
17 that at all these sites the best way to address those
18 sites was to fully excavate and remove all
19 contamination; and sometimes it wasn't the lowest-cost
20 remedy. We talked about that at our committees before,
21 but on a site-by-site basis the Presidio Trust has sites
22 that do constitute a sufficient risk. Our preference is
23 to do clean closure remedies, especially when it's
24 compatible for our restoration goals at the Park. And
25 we're really ready to go extra nine yards for sites that

22

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 have sufficient risk and it really fits in our long-term
2 use vision for Park users and what P-10 and FMFA is
3 suggesting. So there's 50 clean closure sites that
4 we're recommending in the FS.
5 This slide highlights where each of the clean
6 closure sites fall within each watershed.
7 Our "remedy-deferred" sites. So that's two
8 sites where we don't have enough information at the time
9 we issued this FS here in March to recommend remedies.
10 And those two sites are Landfill E. And I think we all
11 knew that Landfill E was not going to have remedy
12 recommendation in the FS. That decision was made a long
13 time ago, because we just didn't have a full
14 investigation of Landfill E last year and that data
15 hasn't been fully analyzed yet, so we're not quite there
16 as far as recommending a remedy yet for Landfill E.
17 Then Fill Site 6-B is what I talked a little
18 bit about last month. It was part of Fill Site 6 that
19 we split into two parts right now, whereas Fill Site 6-A
20 stayed in the FS and it had alternatives analysis for
21 clean closure. Fill Site 6-B has a little reference in
22 the FS; and then it just stops short. There's no
23 further remedies at that site. So those are two sites
24 that we definitely will have to do a FS for in the
25 future. They both fall in the Tennessee Hollow

23

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 watershed.
2 The fourth and final category of remedies is
3 this "land-use controls monitoring-type" remedy. This
4 is another one that we really struggled with a lot.
5 This type of remedy -- I know it's not a favorite type
6 of remedy with the RAB -- or some RAB members, I should
7 say. It's a remedy that the Army recommended quite a
8 bit for almost all their sites. We're now only
9 recommending it for one site. The one site is Battery
10 Howe-Wagner. There are exceedences of cleanup levels in
11 the site for some metals and arsenic. They're now
12 superficial, so we felt that abated the only risk that
13 is posed by this site. And if we had found a source of

RAB April 8 2003.txt

carbon tet, for example, that definitely we would have gone after it. But we can save this for Fort Scott FS and maybe get into the details about what is the right thing to do as far as Battery Howe-Wagner. But after going back and forth quite a bit we believe it's a landscape zone site. It's not a big restoration feature for the Presidio; and it's probably best to leave the existing soil cover there and monitor groundwater.

The ten years is just our guess for FS cost estimate. DTSC will definitely have an opinion on that, and they could go up or down. So that will definitely affect the cost of the monitoring remedy.

24

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

Again, the regulators give comments on whether that's too much or too little monitoring for that particular site once they get a chance to take a look at the data.

As far as costs go, again, that's in Volume II of the FS that breaks it down site by site for all of the sites where we recommend remedies. And actually there's one "no action" site in Graded Area 9, some costs for abandoning some existing groundwater monitoring levels there.

There you have it. The FS is out. We're off and running. And I welcome comments and look forward to them. If you're interested in having me at your subcommittee meetings, I'm happy to attend and bring Chris, and he can answer more questions about the details and site-by-site remedies at the committees. Thank you.

MR. KERN: Questions for Craig?

MR. BERMAN: I think in a sense you were very fortunate that there was no recommended action that really went for groundwater treatment, because there is the potential for large costs. And in reviewing the document I was very happy to see that -- a partial review -- I was very happy to see there was no occasion where you really had to do groundwater remedy. I just

25

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

want to say that I rejoice and I hope others here will rejoice in that, because that would have been a whopping expense and something which is not so simple to do. And I think we're all very fortunate in this process to have escaped that fairly large blow.

MR. COOPER: Yeah. These particular CERCLA sites, based on our groundwater monitoring of them, haven't presented a significant impact to groundwater.

MR. FORD: I agree with you, Sam. It's a lot more fun to move dirt than it is to treat water. Treating water is expensive and it happens very slowly, so it's best to avoid it.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Can you give us an idea of the timing of this document and what comes next?

MR. COOPER: At A RAB committee meeting I handed out a Presidio Trust memo about how we are going to group the sites into future RAPs. And so basically when you take a look at that memo you'll see that we've got a RAP for the next three to four years. And for each RAP, we try to get the RAP done in the summer and

RAB April 8 2003.txt

21 do the construction in late summer and fall. So the
22 next step for this feasibility study is the regulators
23 will definitely comment on my recommendations to look at
24 Baker Beach 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6-A first because
25 those are the ones that are on our construction schedule

26

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 for '03. And for those committees please comment if you
2 have any comments or concerns on the 6-A remedy, because
3 that will be the first RAP that will be spun out of the
4 FS study. Then we've already started the next RAP
5 that's going to be spun out of the FS as the '03 one,
6 and it will come out later this year.

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: Does the Baker Beach FS study
8 have to be finished before the RAP this year?

9 MR. COOPER: For the sites that we write RAPs
10 for, we need CERCLA. And the NCP says that there needs
11 to be an alternatives analysis. And if we have an
12 agreement that the alternatives analysis for those
13 particular sites that we're writing a RAP for is
14 adequate then we can write a RAP for it. So the entire
15 FS doesn't have to be perfect for us to continue to
16 believe to spin out RAPs. It has to be appropriate for
17 the sites that we write RAPs for.

18 MR. BOGGS: Basically, even if we have a few
19 data gaps in a few sites you don't want to hold up the
20 whole remediation program till we get every "t" crossed
21 to provide the analysis in the feasibility study is good
22 enough for a new sites -- I think that 90 percent of
23 sites everybody will see as being an appropriate
24 alternative and the analysis is complete.
25 Ninety percent of those sites could go off in one RAP

27

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 after this while we take time dealing with the last ten
2 percent of the a loose ends that we need to be tied
3 together.

4 MR. YOUNGKIN: So there's no set timetable for
5 the feasibility study, comments, or final or anything
6 like that?

7 MR. COOPER: Well, our master schedule
8 estimated 60 days for the regulators take a look at the
9 feasibility study. But most important are this year's
10 sites. And then there is a schedule for the FS, but I
11 think if it looks good for 90 percent of the sites and
12 if there's comments on those -- there might be some
13 minor comments -- and we can address those in the RAP
14 for those sites. Then for the ten percent that we all
15 agree isn't good, we get comments on those and then
16 those sites will have to -- we do an FS for those sites.

17 MS. BLUM: You mean comments from us or
18 comments from the State or both?

19 MR. COOPER: Everybody.

20 MR. KERN: Are we ready to move on to the
21 petroleum program?

22 MR. FORD: Let me talk for a few minutes about
23 Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5. At Landfill 4 actually last
24 month the digging was complete. We took out about
25 14,500 tons of soil, and now the compost has been spread

28

CLARK REPORTING
Page 12

RAB April 8 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 on the site and stirred in. And there will be tree
2 planting occurring on Saturday April 26th, the
3 Presidio's Arbor Day celebration. Members of the public
4 will be invited to come up and plant some of the
5 eucalyptus seedlings that are going back in at that
6 site. I know most people think it's nuts to plant
7 eucalyptus in there, but you can go up there and discuss
8 it with the forest restoration folks on the 26th. The
9 irrigation should be in by then and ready for the trees.

10 I just threw in a couple of pictures. That is
11 a picture of the big steaming pile over on the left.
12 That is actually the compost that was brought up. They
13 brought up 1,200 cubic yards of compost. It's
14 golf-course chipped trees. They take the stuff out
15 there and spread it out and tilled it. They had a
16 really tough time finding something to till it in
17 because it's not easy to find tilling equipment in San
18 Francisco. So the contractor found a tiller in northern
19 Sonoma County and had it brought down here and used it.
20 But Landfill 4 is basically done. Treadway and Rollo
21 are working on the closure report, so a RAP for that
22 will be coming out in a few months.

23 Fill Site 5, which is on the other side of
24 Washington Boulevard, the digging is pretty well
25 complete. I say that because we're in the process of

29

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 doing conformation sampling because we haven't got all
2 the results back yet, so if we have any samples that
3 exceed cleanup levels we might have to go back and do a
4 little more digging here and there. We hope that won't
5 happen. We took out about 16,000 tons of soil, which
6 is basically about half of what the tonnage that had
7 been estimated originally. So Fill Site 5 was quite a
8 bit smaller than people had estimated. We're going to
9 start finish grading tomorrow. What we're basically
10 doing with the finish grading is we're going to try to
11 restore the land surface to the approximate shape that
12 we see in the 1871 topographic survey of the Presidio.
13 Basically, if you go up there and visit, you'll see it
14 will be kind of a ridge in the middle with two swales on
15 either side, a swale on the north and a swale on the
16 south. The monitoring wells are scheduled to be
17 installed on April 21st, so Fill Site 5 is kind of in
18 the endgame with that site as well.

19 MR. O'HARA: What's the cost there, estimated?

20 MR. FORD: The complete contract for both
21 sites right now is about 2.4 million. And out of that,
22 some -- it's about 1.4 million is Landfill 4 and just
23 under a million for Fill Site 5. Which is a flip-flop.
24 When we went into this we thought that Landfill 4 would
25 be smaller and cheaper; and it ended up being

30

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 significantly more expensive.

2 This is a shot, actually, of one of the last
3 days of hauling at Fill Site 5, where the contractor was
4 able -- they worked down from low on slope up towards
5 the road. When they finished up, they were so close to
6 the road that the trucks actually stayed on Washington

7 Boulevard. Then they just loaded them and hauled them
8 away.
9 That is what the site looked like a couple of
10 days ago. The fill has been taken off the area where
11 the excavator is sitting. It's underlaid by native
12 Colma formation soil. And it's kind of big flat bench,
13 and the Army actually graded it off there and made a
14 parking lot. The area roughly where the excavator is
15 sitting they will be pushing soil up there to
16 reestablish the ridge. And the area right in front of
17 shadows in the foreground will be cut down to make a
18 swale.
19 This is another shot looking northward. You
20 can see -- this shot was taken -- we were standing in
21 the dune sand that occurs at the south end of the site
22 looking across the Colma, which is sandy clay, kind of
23 that yellowish brown in the middle and the white spots
24 there off in the distance are actually exposures of
25 serpentine that occurred on the northern edge of the

31

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 site, so when we're finished we will have the three
2 different kinds of soil exposed.
3 This is actually a view taken looking towards
4 the south. Light-colored soil and rock in the
5 foreground is the serpentine. And Colma in the middle
6 and the dune sand is kind of off in the distance close
7 to where the trees are. But in the foreground of this
8 picture we took off roughly nine or ten feet of fill,
9 so the ground surface has been lowered significantly.
10 The serpentine is exposed because we had a petroleum
11 spill. There was a segment of the fuel distribution
12 system that cut across this site.
13 The fill and the Colma had diesel fuel in it
14 so we excavated that all the way and ended up exposing
15 the serpentine. We had to take a little bit of
16 serpentine out to try to get rid of the petroleum. But
17 we think we succeeded there we're still waiting for the
18 test results.
19 in this case, there's actually a deep pity
20 there that we will have to back fill to get site to
21 drain properly. We're going to try to scrape out as
22 much as of the search teen as we can and then leave it
23 up on the surface where it can help with the
24 establishment of serpentine-loving plants

MR. ULLESVANG: what's the event well use of

32

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 the vite going to be?
2 MR. FORD: It's going to be restored as a
3 natural area. It will basically be a -- Mark, you
4 should jump in after I butcher the terminology. It will
5 be a combination of serpentine grassland and dune scrub
6 habitat.
7 MR. FREY: We don't actually have any
8 experience with planting on cold and dry slopes, so
9 we're not actually sure what plants are going to survive
10 in that habitat, so we're going to learn.
11 MR. ULLESVANG: You have some areas in
12 different parts of the State that have serpentine that
13 they graded down to the serpentine and wound up having a

RAB April 8 2003.txt

14 problem later on since they weren't going to use it for
15 residential use with naturally occurring asbestos.
16 MR. FORD: Right. In fact we're doing an
17 asbestos exposure evaluation right now to find out what
18 happens with restoration planting workers who come on to
19 this site. We want to model what their asbestos
20 exposure looks like so we'll know how to mitigate it. I
21 think it will be in May. We will have people out there
22 with air samplers and respirators and air-sampling
23 pumps. And they will go out and -- they're supposed to
24 model planting activities.
25 I think that Mark Frey has the idea that he's

33

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 actually going to give them plants and make them plant
2 while they're there. But the idea is they will work
3 like a four-hour shift with the sampling pump on. And
4 then they will take that away and analyze it and see if
5 there was any asbestos exposure while they were doing
6 the work. Then from those results we'll be able to
7 extrapolate what has to be done to keep people who were
8 doing restoration work on site safe. We did have to
9 analyze some of these serpentine samples for asbestos
10 and the stuff that's exposed in the bottom of the pit
11 was anywhere from three-quarters to one-percent
12 chrysotile, based on the point-counting microscopic
13 method. And at least we had a chance to compare that
14 with some of the serpentine that's being generated by
15 the bridge retrofit. And their serpentine generally
16 contains anywhere from three- to seven-percent asbestos,
17 so this stuff -- there's less asbestos in it.

18 MR. BERMAN: Just an educational question. Is
19 the asbestos release a result of the planting activity
20 itself, or is it naturally in equilibrium with the
21 atmosphere?

22 MR. FORD: That's a good question. I don't
23 know enough about natural asbestos occurrence. I don't
24 know at this point whether if you just went out and
25 stood in a field of serpentine and didn't do anything

34

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 other than stand still whether you'd be getting an
2 exposure or not.

3 MR. FREY: If it's dry there's that potential.
4 MR. FORD: I imagine it would if it was dust.
5 But here we are actually going to have people who will
6 be on their hands and knees working in this material, so
7 that's what we will try to model. But it is kind of an
8 interesting question, because serpentine occurs in a few
9 other places in the Park and people use those areas. So
10 it's a question that we have to look into eventually.
11 We are kind of tiptoeing into that, building some
12 knowledge about asbestos by looking at this site
13 specifically.

14 MR. FREY: In the area where it's a problem
15 generally there are serpentine barrens; and we really
16 don't have that here, a couple of very small locations.

17 MR. FORD: I think it may be a bigger issue
18 when we get to Baker Beach 1 and 2, which are
19 essentially high-angle -- we expect them to be
20 high-angle serpentine barrens after we remove the fill.

RAB April 8 2003.txt

21 Those are basically serpentine cliffs where the waste
22 has been dumped over the cliff.
23 I actually think over the next year or two we
24 will be collecting a lot of useful information about
25 where there is asbestos in the serpentine and what kinds

35

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 of activity mobilize it and release it into the air. I
2 can't tell you too much about that now, but I think over
3 time we will be able to answer some of those questions.

4 MS. BLUM: I want to understand. The asbestos
5 is coming from the serpentine?

6 MR. FORD: Yeah. Actually, there are several
7 different minerals that can be classified as asbestos,
8 but they're basically little fibrous minerals that tend
9 to occur in veins within the serpentine. So it can be
10 released when you break up the serpentine rock. These
11 little veins can be broken open and the fibers can come
12 out.

13 MR. FREY: And those fibers have never been
14 linked to asbestos disease.

15 MR. ULLESVANG: I don't think that's accurate.
16 We are actively pursuing several regulations as part of
17 construction. We actually had to get an air permit from
18 the local Air District. I think it was the first one to
19 monitor for asbestos in the serpentine. We did a case
20 study. There's some epidemiology work being done.
21 There's a pretty clear link to disturbed serpentinite
22 and lung cancer.

23 So they have linked it but, again, it's when
24 people go up there and stir it up and make it into a
25 dust that it becomes a problem. The wind has been

36

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 blowing along that coast for years,, so all the dust
2 tends to have gotten blown, but if you go in there and
3 you started doing construction now, that's going to
4 break that rock up and could turn that fiber into dust
5 and become airborne and then people can breathe it. So
6 the general thought is that, undisturbed, its general
7 exposure is low but for doing actual work in
8 serpentinite zones, they are developing regulations and
9 work procedures to make sure that the exposure is a
10 minimal amount.

11 MS. BLUM: So basically it's a naturally
12 occurring toxin?

13 MR. BERMAN: That's why you want to make more
14 parking-lots.

15 MR. FORD: Pave it over and that solves the
16 problem.

17 MS. SIEGEL: Wasn't there a lot of historical
18 data from the Kesterson Wildlife Refuge on this issue?

19 MR. ULLESVANG: That was selenium.

20 MS. BLUM: Are there feelings about using that
21 \$100 million to clean up naturally occurring toxins?

22 MR. FORD: Well, just off the top of my head,
23 my feeling would be that we don't -- that's not a
24 problem that the \$100 million was designated for. It
25 could be a very difficult problem, because the

37

CLARK REPORTING
Page 16

1 serpentine does occur naturally. And it's not like you
2 can dig it out.
3 Asbestos is actually an interesting thing. If
4 you ever want to do a Google search on it, usually
5 there's about a thousand different links to the asbestos
6 trade group website. I don't remember exactly what it
7 is, but when you get there you'll know, because it talks
8 about balancing -- it acknowledges that there might be
9 some problems with asbestos, but it urges you to balance
10 consideration of these potential problems with all the
11 great benefits that come from using asbestos. Then you
12 can actually go into their summaries of medical
13 research. They do a fantastic job of parsing it and
14 compartmentalizing it and have you believe -- there are
15 certain people that think there are fibers of only a
16 certain length, that if they are 9 nanometers to 11
17 nanometers they can kill you but less than 9 or more
18 than 11, it's fine. You can eat them for breakfast. So
19 if you want to see industrial lobbying at work I would
20 recommend just do a search on "asbestos institute" or
21 some words like that.
22 MR. BERMAN: But it's true. It takes about 20
23 years for asbestosis to actually become effective, so if
24 you have all your workers at age 75 you wouldn't be --
25 MR. FORD: Cleaning up the naturally occurring

38

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 asbestos, even the Presidio, where there are only four
2 or five big outcrops, wouldn't be practical. You can't
3 dig it out. The more you dig really the more you'd
4 expose.
5 MR. BERMAN: But it's easily covered. If, in
6 fact, it's not really a natural equilibrium, it comes
7 about from disturbing, then you can cover it. This is
8 one case where covering it would eliminate the potential
9 of exposure.
10 MR. FORD: Covering it or keeping it moist.
11 MR. KERN: It might be an appropriate break
12 for now.
13 MR. FORD: I think there's smoke coming off
14 our reporter, so maybe we should take a break.
15 [A BREAK WAS TAKEN FROM 8:17 P.M. TO 8:32 P.M.]
16 MR. KERN: Just to clarify -- Peter was
17 asking -- this is the start of the 10th year so we've
18 completed 9 years.
19 We'll start the discussion in the second part
20 of our meeting tonight with a discussion of some sites
21 that are going to be hopefully cleaned up later this
22 year.
23 MR. FORD: I just want to go over Baker Beach
24 3 and 4 and remind you where they are. They are out in
25 the dunes near Lincoln boulevard. Baker Beach Disturbed

39

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 Area 4 is basically a thumbprint over in the corner.
2 It's a relatively small site. This is a view of Baker
3 Beach 3 from Lincoln Boulevard. That is Battery Crosby
4 in the background. That is a ravine that used to exist
5 out in the dunes, and the Army filled it up with junk,
6 so we're planning to dig out the junk and dirt and

RAB April 8 2003.txt

7 restore the ravine. And we hope to do that in the
8 beginning of October of this year.

9 Earlier today, we had a design review
10 workshop, which is actually first one of these we've
11 done. We had the design engineers from Treadwell &
12 Rollo and Minchew Engineering come and give a
13 presentation on the remedial design. We discussed a few
14 aspects of the RAP and just kind of collected the
15 preliminary comments of our regulators, Bob and Jim.
16 We're going incorporate those comments into the remedial
17 design and then issue a more formal design submittal
18 probably in about another month or six weeks. The idea
19 was to get early input from people so that the designs
20 would be fairly close. When we get to the actual design
21 review submittal it will address most of the concerns
22 that people have. So it can be reviewed and approved
23 fairly promptly. We're shooting for an October
24 construction start. We're going to be exposing dune
25 sand out on the bluffs. We think the potential for

40

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 erosion problems is substantial. So we would like to
2 dig this one in October and November before we really
3 get into the heart of the wet season, and so that's what
4 we're aiming for. It's going to take a little doing,
5 because if you look right now at our master schedule and
6 allow 30 days for review of all the documents and go
7 through that process, you end up with a construction
8 start of something like December 31st. That's not too
9 good. It's a little bit too late to be opening up a
10 site on the coastal bluffs. So right now we're looking
11 at the schedule and trying to figure out where we can
12 compress things and if there are any shortcuts that we
13 can take that will allow us to get the RAP approved and
14 have an approved design and contractor on board around
15 the 1st of October. So we'll be keep you posted on
16 that. And you will see the RAP and various support
17 documents coming out of the Trust at a furious pace over
18 the next few months.

19 Doug, do you want to talk about the design
20 workshop?

21 MR. KERN: I could preview it a little bit.
22 I'm sure you guys will be bringing some of those things
23 to the RAB down the road.

24 When George is talking about the design, he's
25 talking about from which direction are they going to dig

41

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 out the contents and why; where the truck routes are
2 going to come in; what kind of erosion control measures
3 are they going to put in place. There are any number of
4 very detailed design kinds of topics that many of them
5 will be of great interest, I think, to folks here.

6 There are issues, for example, of trucks and
7 the routes and how the trucks would get onto the site.
8 There's a kind of a hairpin curve if they were coming
9 from the Golden Gate Bridge, so the trucks might have to
10 be routed around and turn around and come back up, so
11 they're kind of in the brainstorming phase of that
12 particular item? For example, they could do street
13 routing, or they could have smaller trucks go in and

RAB April 8 2003.txt

14 make the hairpin turn and carry did stuff off to another
15 site, where it would be reloaded into bigger trucks. So
16 it's really looking at a lot of those kinds of issues.

17 As George mentioned, there are a lot of
18 erosion control issues, so they're beginning to
19 brainstorm on that. So stay tuned for that.

20 And those are the kinds of issues that you
21 want to bring to the neighborhood groups that you see
22 and the other community people that you normally talk to
23 spread the word about these sites, because there could
24 be some significant issues with, particularly, the truck
25 traffic.

42

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 The face of that area will also change quite a
2 bit. There are some trees and they will be coming out
3 as well. Just some of the primary things to be looking
4 at down the road.

5 MR. FORD: After we have a little bit of time
6 to kind of digest the comments that were made at the
7 workshop this afternoon and think our way through them,
8 we will come and give kind of a presentation probably at
9 a RAB committee meeting of some of these design issues.
10 We may also give a more detailed presentation at this
11 meeting, assuming that everyone agrees that it's a
12 high-priority topic. So you will be hearing more about
13 that over the next couple of months.

14 MR. BERMAN: I didn't go to the meeting, but I
15 was wondering whether an alternative transport mechanism
16 using dirt barges was considered as a way of avoiding
17 the trucks altogether.

18 MR. FORD: We considered it. We're probably
19 considering it more seriously at Baker Beach 1 and 2,
20 which are cliffside sites. This site is actually pretty
21 far from the beach. The bulk of the fill is quite a
22 distance up the hill, and this does not appear to lend
23 itself quite as neatly to the use of a barge. But that
24 is something that we're considering as we go along.

25 MR. BERMAN: Because you're going to chop down

43

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 -- you're going to open the ravine and that just means
2 moving the stuff a couple of hundred feet from the
3 hillside to the shoreline, which is not in anybody's
4 way, so to speak. There's no traffic there, no roads,
5 no buildings, no nothing. So you could probably make a
6 pathway that would allow the equipment -- you could
7 scoop it and then bring it down the pathway and load it
8 on the barge at the end of the pathway. Since you're
9 considering that for 1 and 2, you've already looked at
10 the whole cost of barging and moving stuff.

11 In a sense, if it's feasible it has a certain
12 attraction in that you don't have all that land traffic
13 to deal with and the safety issues and the dirt on roads
14 and possibility of accidents. All that is eliminated.
15 There's got to be a certain economic factor that goes
16 into the contingencies for all that that might be used
17 more efficiently with the barge transport.

18 MR. FORD: Well, there's a possibility that a
19 barge alternative might be cost-effective; although,
20 when you start using a barge, there are other

RAB April 8 2003.txt

21 uncertainties that are brought into it. For one thing,
22 the coastline here is not a protected harbor. It
23 actually faces northwestward right out into the open
24 ocean, and any barge operation will have to be designed
25 to accommodate potentially pretty good surf. And what

44

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 contacts we have had with marine contractors, big surf
2 they don't like. They like to use barges in kind of
3 protected areas where they are dealing with a tidal
4 fluctuation but they have not got a lot of waves.

5 There's also a double-handling issue in that,
6 as far as we know, there is no -- if you put this
7 material on a barge, the cheapest disposal option is
8 ocean dumping. And, as far as we believe, that's
9 probably illegal and -- and even if it wasn't illegal,
10 it might not be something that we'd want to do.

11 So if we're not going to dump it out in the
12 Farallons, we have to take the barge some place and
13 offload the material and possibly truck it to a landfill
14 or put it someplace else. And there's a whole chain of
15 issues that come along with using a barge that we're
16 looking into.

17 Another factor that I'm concerned about is we
18 think a barge operation may become cost-effective if you
19 have a really large landfill. And my sense right now is
20 that the estimate of the size of this landfill has been
21 over-estimated in the past. I think the EKI 1999
22 estimate was about 30,000 cubic yards or something like
23 that; but now, as Treadwell takes a second look at it
24 and parses it a little more carefully, their estimates
25 are coming up half of that, 15,000 cubic yards. I think

45

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 if the volume gets smaller, once you get below a certain
2 point, it may not be cost-effective to use a barge. But
3 we are looking at that. It would be nice to keep the
4 roads clear.

5 So I think at the moment there's a better
6 chance that a barge might be used at Baker Beach 1 and
7 2. But we'll see. The case there, there is no truck
8 access to either site. Land removal will have to be
9 done almost entirely by a crane lifting the material up
10 a cliff and swinging it over an existing battery that
11 has to be reserved.

12 So Baker Beach 1 and 2 have some logistical
13 problems that are worse than what we face here at 3, so
14 a barge may end up being the way we go there.

15 Fill Site 6-A is another one that's on the
16 schedule to do this year. We'll probably start it a
17 little bit after we do Baker Beach 3 and 4, but we think
18 this site is a better site. We can do this one in the
19 winter. It isn't steeply sloped. It's not a bunch of
20 sand dunes on a cliff, so we think the erosion control
21 issues are going to be easier to handle.

22 This is a big field that's across the street
23 from the YMCA. And it's another site that we think has
24 somewhere between 10 and 15,000 cubic yards of fill.
25 We'll be removing the stream. Tennessee Creek is

46

CLARK REPORTING
Page 20

RAB April 8 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 actually within a 72-inch pipe crossing Fill Site 6-A.
2 Our plan is to remove the pipe and daylight the creek
3 and put it in a restored stream channel. So we actually
4 have a stream restoration person working with the design
5 team to come up with grading plans so that we actually
6 get a proper-looking stream when we're done.

7 MS. TRIGIANI: Where is 6-B in relation to
8 that?

9 MR. FORD: Craig has a board that he will hold
10 up. [indicating]

11 MS. TRIGIANI: In terms of that restoration,
12 do you work from old photographs or old elevations or --

13 MR. FORD: Actually, the sketches that are
14 being done of the post-construction topography are being
15 based on the 1871 topo. It will have to be adjusted,
16 because there are buildings there; and some of the
17 surface drainage has been changed around; but they're
18 trying to be as faithful as they can to the 1871
19 topography.

20 MS. WRIGHT: Will all of the underground pipe
21 be removed or just that portion ultimately on the
22 restoration.

23 MR. FORD: I think ultimately on the
24 restoration of Tennessee Hollow the intention is to get
25 rid of all the pipe. But at this point it's about

47

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 300 feet that we'll be taking out across the site. The
2 stream will come out of a pipe; it will traverse a
3 reconstructed stream bed and then at the north end of
4 the site, which is the lower end of the site, it will go
5 back into the pipe and continue on in the pipe down to
6 the Marsh.

7 Okay. We've scheduled a design review
8 workshop for April 29 in the morning? There's always a
9 possibility that may shift to the afternoon or another
10 day around there. Most likely this one will start in
11 December or January. We think we can do this one in the
12 winter. We don't have a lot of bird or wildlife issues
13 that we have to deal with. So winter and very early
14 spring should be okay.

15 MR. KERN: There is a point about Fill Site 6
16 though. It's going to be very, very visible to the
17 public so that the RAB will really want to have a lot of
18 discussion and be really well informed about some of the
19 design issues, truck routes, what is it going to look
20 like, so you can start telling people and getting that
21 word out. It's really going to be the kick-off site for
22 the Tennessee Hollow restoration. There are other teams
23 already working on what the restoration it's going to
24 look like. Even though it's a little piece, we want
25 this section to really work. So having people now ask a

48

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 lot of questions about what's going to happen and
2 provide a lot of good input to the group will be
3 important.

4 MS. BLUM: Is there already a joint team
5 between the RAB and GGRNA or whatever on the Tennessee
6 Hollow restoration site as to how the two groups are

Page 21

RAB April 8 2003.txt

7 working together to restore Tennessee Hollow? In other
8 words, I feel like that should be a joint communication
9 effort. I know the Park is going to work together
10 because it's of such great public interest. So are we
11 working with somebody?

12 MR. KERN: I know that Brian and Mark and a
13 lot of people are involved in design issues, restoration
14 issues, and what the site will look like once George's
15 group has got it kind of fixed, but it's kind of
16 interesting that way. The remediation program is really
17 driving the restoration in a lot of ways. And so some
18 of it may be a little bit in advance of what the
19 completed restoration will be, because, as George
20 mentioned, there's a pipe. And that pipe may not be
21 eventually where the stream is going to be, so there may
22 be some issues about where the stream is coming close.
23 We're thinking about all those things. I think it would
24 probably be a good part of a discussion. Maybe we can
25 invite some of those team members to that discussion to

49

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 try to do what you say to show the blending of
2 remediation and the ongoing restoration that's happening
3 really simultaneously.

4 That really should be said about Baker Beach 3
5 and 4. I learned today at the design meeting that there
6 are plants already in the nursery that will be planted
7 right after Baker Beach 3 is excavated. So the teams
8 are working on all these remediation sites to try to
9 make the restoration come right behind it as much as
10 possible. So it might be good to work out that kind of
11 meeting.

12 MS. BLUM: George, you said that the stream
13 will come out of the pipe. There are two outlets into
14 Crissy Marsh, aren't there. Two water-fed areas from
15 Tennessee Hollow?

16 MR. FORD: I think that's correct. There are
17 at least two. There might be some more.

18 MS. BLUM: This one is going to be what I call
19 the submarsh or the loon area. Is that the last drain?

20 MR. BOGGS: It's the big drain across the
21 street from Halleck Street.

22 MR. YOUNGKIN: Near the footbridge that goes
23 over the Marsh.

24 MS. BLUM: Oh, I would think there will be a
25 whole a lot of interest in that.

50

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. ULLESVANG: That drain actually includes
2 two or three drains coming in together right there.
3 This is a big component of that drain.

4 MS. BLUM: Especially since the public has
5 just finished commenting on the scoping process on
6 Tennessee Hollow, I think some people could easily be
7 alarmed, as they are so readily with the Park, because
8 they think they have been part of the process and now
9 they see work starting and they haven't heard the
10 results of the scoping process yet. So I think you
11 always have that to deal with.

12 MR. ULLESVANG: I think that one of the
13 messages is that this is the cleanup for preceding any

RAB April 8 2003.txt

of the alternatives that are within the scoping.

MS. BLUM: I think the point that I was trying to make is that we really need to have a really clear communication on what's going on here, because Crissy Marsh is an incendiary point of contact with the public. So what happens to it everyone cares so much. Thank you.

MR. ULLESVANG: As you all interact with other people you have to pass on that knowledge and keep the dialogue going and correct any misconceptions that you hear of or help direct anyone to the Park Service or the Trust to continue the dialogue with someone that is

51

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

confused or wants more information.

MR. KERN: Just to follow the up, there will be additional scoping comments accepted on Tennessee Hollow. I think there will be some more meetings and public scoping that will still be available. So we should probably get some more of that word out to more people. I understand from the project manager that there will be additional scoping.

MS. TRIGIANI: It just raises an issue in my mind that I always sort of come back to. And that is that I wonder -- and I don't view this as this particular team and the people we see here every month as a mission for you guys.

It seems to me to be more of a Trust communication staff issue. I don't get the sense that there's really a lot of orchestrating going on in terms of getting messages out. I'm sure they're working very hard at it, but there doesn't seem to be some sort of a master plan for communicating on a regular basis with the stakeholders and constituents of the Presidio. And it just seems to me -- I don't know if this is something that we can push for from this forum or something that you guys can raise as having heard within this forum but maybe you're doing things.

MR. COOPER: You mean Tennessee Hollow?

52

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

MS. TRIGIANI: In all of this. It's just sort of stuff happens and people know what's going on and then they answer the question. I think they could be a lot more assertive in terms -- maybe they're doing it for other reasons. But as a constituent, I feel like I hear things after a decision has been made. And I think of this as a constructive observation in addition to Jan's point.

Brian gave a beautiful explanation. It makes perfect sense. Someone is going to argue with that, fine. But maybe if they heard that on a well-timed basis there wouldn't be any antagonism or troubles over it. So just being around this town for a year and a half, I just feel like it is very slow. You want it to click a little faster.

I would recommend regular press releases on this. It will only be good for the public to hear all these things. Outreach with media more. More public meetings maybe.

MR. COOPER: On Tennessee Hollow or on the

21 remediation program.
22 MS. TRIGIANI: Both of those, I guess. On the
23 Tennessee Hollow issue, if there's a large constituency
24 all pepped up over it get them to the table a little bit
25 more.

53

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Again, I come at this -- clearly, to me it's
2 an institutional thing on the Trust's part that I think
3 they can pay more attention to preclude
4 MR. COOPER: I think they've had two big
5 public forums separated by a year or so.
6 MR. KERN: That's one of the things about this
7 group. We meet twice a month and it tends to bring out
8 some of those issues, but it may be time to --
9 especially like a "Friends of Tennessee Hollow" group
10 and start our own meetings and invite stakeholders and
11 things like that, too.
12 MR. COOPER: Like a RAB-type community group
13 for Tennessee Hollow projects.
14 MR. KERN: If we want to start establishing a
15 means of getting information flowing, there's nothing
16 like starting a group and start inviting agencies and
17 people to that meeting and experts, the
18 environmentalists, and community people. As Mary said,
19 they are rabid about this particular project, so more
20 information than less.
21 MS. SIEGEL: You just said there was a scoping
22 meeting recently on Tennessee Hollow for the development
23 and now the remediation. But I think the public can't
24 make that distinction. It certainly is not as clear.
25 So within the structure of the Trust the remediation

54

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 folks have to talk to the development people.
2 MR. COOPER: We definitely meet internally.
3 MS. SIEGEL: Then you guys can see the
4 convergence of these issues meet, where the public may
5 not. If you're going to start working on a fill site
6 when someone says, "Wait, didn't we just have a meeting
7 about what's going to happen there?" then people get a
8 little bent out of shape.
9 MR. COOPER: Right. We definitely keep Alison
10 Stone and the Tennessee Hollow group at the Trust and
11 the Park Service informed on what's happening with
12 remediation. How Alison and that group is communicating
13 with all their external stakeholders about how her
14 entire project is going and how the remediation is
15 influencing work inside her project area I guess is kind
16 of her venue to do that.
17 MS. TRIGIANI: I view this as a communications
18 problem not -- I have no basis to know that it's
19 anything else. But there's a communications issue.
20 MR. COOPER: Right. For example, on the
21 remediation you guys are getting the inside scoop every
22 two weeks on exactly what's going on. I think you might
23 find interesting, Mary, when we issued the proposed plan
24 for Baker Beach 3, 4 and Fill Site 6-A, we have to
25 present that, because we're presenting that to the

55

1 larger public. We're actually presenting it, like,
2 "What do you think?" We all here are predicting that
3 your recommended remedy on this design is going to be a
4 go. So that larger public -- when I have this fill site
5 meeting, I'm presenting it like, "What do you think?"
6 But you guys, because you come here two times a month,
7 get that inside scoop and all the details on why we're
8 recommending these remedies and what the details are.
9 And that may be something that Alison can do. If she
10 had the means to have that meeting more frequently
11 rather than these large annual public forums, which are
12 a little bit more than that.

13 MR. BERMAN: I wonder if this would be an
14 appropriate issue for a RAB article just to discuss.
15 Base it on Brian's remarks on remediation and
16 restoration, what are they and how do they follow. It
17 seems like it would be one page that would explain this
18 process. It's a little outside the RAB's perspective,
19 but it seems to me that it's an issue that neatly fits
20 in our overall responsibility, in a sense.

21 MS. BLUM: In the simplest language possible.

22 MR. BERMAN: Right. Because there's a process
23 here and Brian explained it very nicely. And I think
24 that could be expanded into a few hundred words and it
25 would be a very timely, something that's timely because

56

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 of the particular RAPs that are coming up, which are
2 going to be visible to the public. The actual
3 remediation may not signify the same expertise as the
4 restoration and the future use. It seems like it's a
5 little beyond what the RAB does, but it seems like it's
6 a communication that's pretty simple, especially if we
7 get some help from Brian.

8 MR. COOPER: Would you like to take a shot at
9 that article, or would you like that to be a Presidio
10 Trust article?

11 MR. BERMAN: It's slightly more appropriate
12 for the Trust to say it, because it's somewhat outside
13 the RAB. But it would be seem to me that an article
14 like that in the Post might be --

15 MR. COOPER: Remediation to restoration.

16 MR. BERMAN: Right. The other way of
17 improving this communication is that there are local --
18 one channel on TV that deals with local city of San
19 Francisco issues, although the Presidio is not formally
20 a part of the city of San Francisco, it's surrounded by
21 the city of San Francisco. And you could have a --
22 they're probably looking for interesting material for
23 that TV program. Maybe once in a while a discussion.

24 MR. COOPER: Once we have some success stories
25 under our belt --

57

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. BERMAN: But not even necessarily success
2 stories, just this is sort of your Park in the city of
3 San Francisco. These are some of the things that are
4 going on. It might be easy. You don't have to write a
5 lot of stuff. You have someone like yourself there
6 that's knowledgeable and can get up there and give a

7 good spiel.
8 MR. BOGGS: The Army did a videotape. That
9 was before my time.
10 MR. O'HARA: I remember it. It has been done.
11 I thought it was very effective, because, from the
12 perspective of the presenter, there were a number of
13 remediation issues. And there were two or three people
14 that were participating in this and took a camera
15 through what some of the problems were and what the
16 proposed remediation issues were a.n.d I've seen it two
17 or three times, years ago.
18 MS. SIEGEL: April 29th, we're having that
19 tree planting? Is that the restoration side doing that?
20 MR. COOPER: Yes.
21 MS. SIEGEL: So maybe that's an opportunity
22 for the remediation folks to get their either a schedule
23 or what's next or what's coming up to sort of try and
24 get some meshing of the restoration and the remediation,
25 to try and find something. It might be an opportunity.

58

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 They will probably get press and publicity. And here's
2 an opportunity to say we're doing this restoration
3 because there's a lot of remediation that's going on.
4 MR. KERN: I should probably jump in.
5 Partially I'm responsible for opening up this topic
6 because I mentioned Fill Site 6 and all the issues
7 around it. And really a little bit off the agenda. I
8 do want to bring it back. It is a really important
9 issue. It may be beyond our purview. And there is
10 certainly interest around the table, but I should also
11 try and pull it back and get done with our agenda.
12 And then I have made some notes about articles
13 and other media things, so we can come back to this on a
14 future agenda. But if you'll allow me to move it along.
15 Thank you.
16 George, did you have anything else?
17 MR. FORD: I have nothing else to say except
18 the petroleum. It's after 9:00, so I'll go through them
19 fairly quickly.
20 The first one -- as I hope you're aware, Jim
21 Ponton is working on updating the two Board orders that
22 are binding on the Presidio. One of them was issued --
23 they were both issued to the Army, one in 1991 and one
24 in 1996. And quite a few things have happened since
25 then; and the Presidio has been turned over to the

59

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Trust. And so he has put together an updated order.
2 I gather your management is reviewing it right
3 now?
4 MR. PONTON: I was going to you update that,
5 but, yes, it's come back to me. I'm doing a full set of
6 revisions.
7 MR. FORD: Okay. But the plan would be to
8 complete a revised order so that it could be brought in
9 front of the Water Board this summer, possibly in the
10 July board meeting, maybe in August, but sometime this
11 summer.
12 The new order would become effective. So
13 there will be more news about that. The idea is to

RAB April 8 2003.txt

basically streamline the two older orders and bring things up to date and eliminate things that don't need to be done anymore. So the Trust and the Park Service have been working with Jim to try to help him with that process.

We have a bunch of corrective action plans going on at Building 1065, Commissary 1349. And 207-231. So Building 1065, the interim data report is out. A tank was recently removed at Building 1047. That tank was not on any of the Army's compliance records, but the contractor was out there walking around. They found some vent pipes sticking up the wall

60

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

of Building 1047; and they followed them and found several tanks under the street, which they then removed. The solvent had been removed. They'll be putting together a tank removal report which I think will be folded into the Building 1065 area corrective action plan.

We are doing an interim action plan to propose a kind of rapid-fire cleanup of a certain area within Building 1065 area. The Trust is building a recycled water treatment plant that would treat some of the sewage flow to pull up basically to purify it and create water that can be used for irrigation. There's a large storage tank that is needed for that project that's going to go smack in the middle of the 1065 spill area. They need to have that area cleaned so that they can building tanks in the fall. So in order to get paperwork done in time to do that cleanup, the Trust is proposing to do an interim action, which is basically going to be digging a whole and cleaning up the area right in the footprint of the tank and in the adjacent areas where the tank supply piping will have to be installed. That is scheduled to come out in about another week.

We are also working on a draft comprehensive plan which really covers the whole Building 1065 area;

61

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

and we expect to get an internal review copy of that late next month. So that will presumably take probably six weeks or so to go through an internal review and revision schedule, possibly in July, that will be coming out for all the stakeholders to review.

MS. BLUM: Will you be able to isolate your work in 1065 from all the other things that need to going on in Area A? It just seems like the whole area is so dirty. Will you be able to do what you need to do without having to do more?

MR. FORD: I think so. The Building 1065 area is kind of one large central spill, with some little satellite issues of much smaller extent and importance in the surrounding area. And I think this interim action that is going to actually be focused right in the central spill area is sort of a coincidence. I think we will be able to confine work to a rational cleanup area and get it done. We do want to follow it up with a cap that will address all the lesser spots. The idea is that the corrective action plan will really draw a

RAB April 8 2003.txt

boundary around the whole site; and it will address all of them in turn and take care of it.

This is a little bit more detail in the interim data report, which came out about a month ago for information on the tank removal. It's called

62

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

Stoddard solvent. They took it out the week of March 3rd. They did find groundwater in the excavation and had a hit of gasoline just above the stream level. So we're going to propose that we install a groundwater monitor downgrade of the tank removal area to see if the gasoline hit in the groundwater is real.

MR. ULLESVANG: You might want to point out that it will be likely that the Stoddard solvent would be detected as gasoline since it's in that carbon range.

MR. FORD: It's kind of like a relative of gasoline.

These are some more details on the interim action plan. When we do a more detailed update on Building 1065, we'll ask Ryan Sielbach, who is in our office, to come in and give an update. It will be good for him to have a chance to explain what he's been doing.

The Commissary PX Phase 2 field program was performed in January and Treadwell is now working on a report for the Phase 2 investigations. As you might recall, the first phase was done last fall. And it was basically kind of a screening level survey. A lot of samples. And in areas where contaminants were found in the first round of sampling, we went back in the second round and did more rounds in those areas to try to

63

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

define what was there. That report is scheduled to come out at the end of this month.

Building 1349 Corrective Action. This site is the base former fuel oil storage tank that is right across Washington Boulevard from Fill Site 5. We have done a Phase 1 investigation and sent out a proposal for Phase 2 sampling. And we are still waiting for comments

We did a field walk. We got regulators and engineers and Trust personnel and the Park Service to walk around Building 1349 and Fill Site 5 site to try to coordinate the installation of monitoring wells. We are going to be installing the monitoring wells at Fill Site 5 later this month. We wanted to make sure that was done in a way that dovetailed sensibly with the work at 1349. So we picked out one location that makes sense in terms of the objectives of both projects.

And Building 207-231 Corrective Action is in work plan data gap investigation. Work plan was issued last week. And so after they get issued people can look at it and we will get comments, revise it, and then go out and do a site investigation to try to fill in the data gaps. After that, with that information, we will write a new corrective action plan that we hope will achieve approval in a way that the Army's corrective action plan never did.

64

CLARK REPORTING
Page 28

RAB April 8 2003.txt
(510) 486-0700

1 The minicaps. These are sites where tanks
2 were removed and there was a leak and the Army did a
3 partial cleanup but didn't achieve cleanup levels. We
4 have grouped those into a couple of different groups and
5 they're under way.

6 We are finishing up with tank removals. We
7 are working on removal reports for 14 tanks that were
8 taken out of coastal batteries in Area A. And they're
9 still working on some other tank removal reports for
10 tanks that were taken out in Area B.

11 That's the end of my story.

12 MR. KERN: Any questions for George?

13 Thank you, George.

14 MR. KERN: Item 6. Jim?

15 MR. PONTON: Just to go along with what George
16 was saying, I wrote a tentative order draft that went to
17 my boss, who was here earlier. And I received comments
18 and I'm revising it. What the new order will do is
19 rescind -- it will put an end to the two old orders.
20 First of all, an order basically lays out our
21 recommended approach for cleaning up the site for
22 petroleum issues; and staff may -- I make
23 recommendations in there based on input from everyone;
24 and it's brought before our Board at a formal hearing.
25 It's reviewed by the public for a period. Staff

65

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 recommendation then to be adopted. And the Board votes
2 on it as to whether or not they believe it should be
3 adopted, and at that time if it's adopted it becomes
4 enforceable. What this order calls for is, it will
5 update everything that's happened at the site since 1991
6 and 1996, when the old orders were issued.

7 It will basically present -- that's probably
8 the most difficult part of it. It will update all the
9 findings. It will update the CERCLA program. It will
10 include concentrations that were detected in the
11 groundwater and soil and a lot of different things. It
12 will bring everything together that acts as a basis for
13 the tasks that shall be outlined further in the order.

14 One principal task is the schedule. And it's
15 going to ask for a master schedule that the Trust and
16 the Park Service puts together for remediating the
17 petroleum sites on the Presidio. And, once that
18 schedule is established, those dates that are developed
19 on that schedule become part of the order. It will
20 cover the corrective action plan sites which have
21 impacts on groundwater. Then closing out all the tanks
22 on site. There are over 2,000 of those sites that have
23 leaked and they have to be closed through our database
24 process into a formal process with me -- or with our
25 staff, rather. That's about it.

66

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 The time frame for that is I'm going to answer
2 all the responded comments internally from my boss by
3 Thursday. Then it will go to the division chief and our
4 attorneys. Then I'm hoping to get it out for public
5 comment and the Presidio Trust and Park Service
6 comment -- DTSC, hopefully in the May time frame. That

RAB April 8 2003.txt

gives me June to respond to comments. Then we will bring it before the Board in July. That all may shift a month, based on staffing issues and scheduling issues.

MR. COOPER: For the public comment, how do you make that known to the public?

MR. PONTON: Generally, it's mailed out to all the stakeholders that are interested. RAB members will get it. Any interested community groups will get it. There's really no ads in the paper, but it will be posted at our Internet site. So it will be available through web access. The meeting is open to the public. People can come and testify before the Board. If it's not contested and it appears that everyone is happy with it, then it's normally a consent item that they just basically vote on.

If it's an issue that requires presentation I'd be prepared to give that. And then people can stand before the Board and give testimony whether they think how they feel about it.

67

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

MR. ULLESVANG: Will there be any advance review for the RAB and the Park Service and the public?

MR. PONTON: I would guess probably not. There's really no surprises in this. It's basically an update to the old order and basically breaks it into elements that have been established by the Trust in recent years. It builds upon the minicap concept, the cap concept. It basically requires a schedule that's been lacking, a schedule that keeps it on track.

Also, there's some tasks in there to fill some data gaps. For Tennessee Hollow, there were gasoline numbers prepared for that corridor for fresh water habitat. We need to look at diesel fuel oil numbers for that. So that's an old task in the order to come up with those numbers. And I think that's underway already. So almost everything that's in the order is in the process of being done already at the Presidio. It's just basically putting it into an enforceable legal document that reflects the status of the site in 2003.

I'll get back to you. I think you probably have it. We've kind of reviewed the main ideas. I'll let you know if there's going to be a prerelease copy, but at this point I'd guess not.

MR. ULLESVANG: I think for the '96 work there was.

68

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

MR. PONTON: That period under the Army?

MR. ULLESVANG: Correct.

MR. BERMAN: Is the change order affecting the commissary, do you know?

MR. PONTON: Yes. It will include the commissary PA cap site by the order. The earliest orders, like the '91 order, included 207 and 231 in the 937. Well, 937 is really wrapped up into another RAP. And 207-231 are kind of wrapped up into part of the DEH site. They will remain their own site, but the 900 series part of the RAP captured that part of the order. So it's basically kind of reestablishes what the cap sites are and the tank closure process. And it will

RAB April 8 2003.txt

14 also update all the current regular legislation and
15 state policies that have changed since adoption of those
16 orders. There's been evidence shown that monitor
17 continuation, in some cases, is an option which is
18 looked upon favorably when you're looking at residual
19 concentrations that really can't be remediated or not
20 worthy of being treated -- things like that.
21 To try and answer your question, Brian there's
22 really no surprises in this. It's only organized in a
23 different way. It doesn't change the cleanup goals that
24 have been established, for example.
25 MR. KERN: Thank you.

69

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Any new business?
2 MS. BLUM: I'm not sure that this is the
3 appropriate place, so help me if I'm wrong. George was
4 kind enough to give us summary of expenditures through
5 June 13th, 2002. And I would love, if possible, if you
6 could update.
7 MR. FORD: There's a new one.
8 MS. BLUM: Okay. Thank you.
9 MR. COOPER: Maybe at the next committee
10 meeting, we talked about when you guys wanted finance
11 updates, quarterly at the most. So maybe at the next
12 time when we talked about agenda items for the March
13 committee meeting. We could certainly do that.
14 MR. KERN: Any other new business?
15 Okay. Here are the action items that I have.
16 Jan is going to talk to Julian about looking at the
17 bylaws, perhaps in general, but specifically with
18 respect to these leave issues.
19 May 9th or 10th is the deadline for getting
20 the newsletter articles.
21 And we have news ideas circulating. Is there
22 anybody that's here tonight that's interested in writing
23 an article? If you are, please talk to Julie or myself.
24 Usually it devolves to one of us to get something put
25 together. One of the options for the RAB is what's

70

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 really hot right now.
2 And the FS is out there and describing our
3 working group process and what we're doing. We could
4 describe the sites. And we're looking at the
5 feasibility study. So, if anybody is interested in
6 talking about that, please let me know. We need to
7 schedule perhaps at a committee meeting or a RAB meeting
8 and bring together some folks who can talk about the
9 restoration end and the cleanup end that is sort of
10 melding at Baker Beach 3 and Fill Site 6.
11 There was discussion around Tennessee Hollow,
12 a variety of issues including media, press, perhaps
13 getting a friends group established -- a little bit
14 outside our purview here. But some of it could be
15 pertinent so we need to keep that discussion going.
16 Something that just got mentioned is a summary
17 of expenditures. That could be handed out.
18 So we have some agenda items and plenty of
19 things. So get that to Mark. He'll do his magic to
20 works out an agenda for the next meeting. And probably

21 RAB April 8 2003.txt
22 at that meeting we will work out what we want to do for
23 the May RAB meeting.
24 Any other comments before we adjourn? Seeing
25 none, then, thank you for coming out and participating
tonight. And, without objection, meeting adjourned.

71

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700
[MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:47.]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

72

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700
MEMBERS PRESENT

1
2 Sam Berman
3 Jan Blum
4 Craig Cooper, Presidio Trust
5 George Ford, Presidio Trust
6 Mark Frey, Presidio Trust
7 Joel Hermann
8 Doug Kern
9 Peter O'Hara
10 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Quality Control Board
11 Sara Siegel
12 David Sutter
13 Mary Trigianni
14 Brian Ullensvang, National Park Service
15 Tracy Wright
16 Mark Youngkin
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

MAY 13, 2003

7:00 p.m.

---o0o---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201

BERKELEY, CA 94704

510 486-0700

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

PROCEEDINGS

---o0o---

MR. KERN: Good evening. This is the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board. We'd like to welcome everyone here tonight to tonight's meeting: Presidio Trust and their contractors. I see two representatives from the National Park Service here tonight. Our regulatory community, thanks for being here, and the RAB community members, and certainly any members of the audience that are public members, thanks for coming out tonight.

Are there any changes or additions to tonight's agenda? Seeing none. Any announcements?

Any old business? I think we have on the agenda a status of the articles. I know that we have completed and submitted an article, so the RAB community's article was in and kind of going through additional review. So we'll see where that is.

Community business. Mark isn't here yet, so I can delay Mark's report.

Feasibility Study Working Groups. Jack is not yet here, so he can't give a report, but perhaps Mary, would you like to give a report on the status of our letter?

MS. TRIGIANI: We received a response from Craig Cooper, and --

3

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: You got my E-mail.

2 MS. TRIGIANI: We got your E-mail. So we're
3 scheduling some time to go over it and study it.

4 MR. KERN: This is a request to Craig. We
5 extended to Craig a preliminary draft of the group's
6 letter. He had some questions on some technical issues

7 and that's provided some feedback.

8 MS. TRIGIANI: Right. Which we will then
9 study and feed back to him.

10 MR. KERN: So we have the Lobos Creek Group.
11 Do you have anything to report?

12 MS. CHEEVER: Not since our committee meeting
13 about two weeks ago -- or was it three weeks ago when we
14 said what we'd gone over?

15 MR. KERN: Sam. Is he here? Anything from
16 your group?

17 MR. BERMAN: Sarah and I are the two group.
18 She's in Europe for the last ten days, and I've been on
19 the East Coast working. I got back last night. So we
20 have only to report that so far neither of us has come
21 down with SARS.

22 MR. KERN: The group is free from SARS. I'll
23 make a note of that. And then there is the Coastal
24 Floods Group. Well, that should be a relatively easy
25 one. Well, we'll come back to Mark if he arrives later.

4

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Let's move on to Item 5, Reports and Discussions,
2 and Jim of the Regional Water Quality Control.

3 MR. PONTON: Tonight I thought I'd take ten
4 minutes to talk briefly about the Tentative Site Cleanup
5 Requirements Order that has recently been issued for the
6 Presidio to secure the petroleum cleanup at the site. I
7 thought I would do that by putting the Order in context
8 with where the Water Board fits into the State process
9 and how the Order is built upon existing documentation
10 that we follow in preparing orders.

11 I work for the Water Board, Region 2 of the Water
12 Board. There are nine regions in the State of
13 California, and they all report to the State Water
14 Quality Control Board in Sacramento, and they oversee
15 the nine regional boards. And the regional boards are
16 all based on watersheds. So there is a LA-based
17 scenario, there is a Tahoe, a North Coast, Central
18 Valley. We're Region 2. We're in an area that is
19 basically drainage from Rohnert Park down to San Jose
20 and east to Livermore towards the Golden Gate.

21 Also in our region we get a lot of delta flow. We
22 get a lot of water that's brought in from the Central
23 Valley and also from the mountainous areas of
24 California. So we have other source areas which flow
25 into our region that we administer.

5

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 The Water Board was established by California
2 legislation in 1967 to administer water rights. They
3 oversee the implementation of the Federal Clean Water
4 Act, and principally they worked under the Porter
5 Cologne Act, which was adopted in 1969. The Porter
6 Cologne Act was pretty instrumental back then in that it
7 was used by the Federal Government to model the Clean
8 Water Act in '72.

9 The State Water Board consists of five
10 governor-appointed members, and as I said, they oversee
11 nine boards to which we will refer to. Region 2 is a
12 nine member governor-appointed board. They serve a
13 four-year term. They serve without pay, and they
14 represent different facets of society, i.e. irrigated

15 ag, municipal government, recreation, fish and wildlife,
16 water supply, water quality and county government. The
17 only condition for a member to -- well, not the only
18 condition, but one important condition -- is that the
19 members must either reside and maintain a business in
20 the area, Region 2, and must have some knowledge of
21 water quality issues.

22 The mission of Region 2 is to protect and enhance
23 the waters of the Bay Area. They do that through the
24 creation of a Basin Plan. A Basin Plan is mandated by
25 Porter Cologne, and this is basically our bible. This

6

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 defines all of the watersheds in the region, and it
2 defines what beneficial uses the water can be used for.

3 Beneficial uses include municipal consumption. So
4 that would be drinking water, fresh water replenishment,
5 ag applications and industrial applications and process
6 applications. We do that through adopting orders, and
7 we also do that through adopting permits, and we do that
8 through coordination with other public agencies.

9 The Basin Plan, as I said, is our bible, and it's
10 required by the Porter Cologne Act. It was first
11 adopted in '68.

12 Beneficial uses are a very important concept
13 because that what steers the Order. The beneficial uses
14 that are designated for the Presidio waters are that of
15 the highest quality for municipal consumption, unless
16 you're in a salt-water area where it's too salty to be
17 consumed. So the goal here is at least to shoot for as
18 clean as possible cleanup level for groundwater and

19 surface waters in the Presidio.

20 As I said, the quality of the (INAUDIBLE) falls
21 within the San Francisco Sands groundwater basin. It's
22 the only site with fresh water serving as part of the
23 drinking water supply in San Francisco. It was the
24 origin of the first water company in San Francisco to
25 get a water supply to the city in the 1800s. And as I

7

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 said before, the beneficial uses are key. They include
2 municipal supply which is one of the cleanest
3 applications; industrial process, surface water and
4 fresh water replenishment.

5 Those concepts are all spelled out in the findings
6 of the Order. The Order has a few parts, but the
7 (INAUDIBLE) are the findings, and the findings specify
8 what is known about the factual bases for the site.

9 So I'm getting specific on the Tentative Site
10 Cleanup Requirements Order. The authority for us to
11 issue that is under Section 13304 of the Porter-Cologne
12 Water Quality Control Act. It's a water code. And
13 fundamentally it requires that anyone who has discharged
14 waste in our state is required to stop that discharge
15 and clean it up.

16 General elements of SCRs are findings, which we
17 just said are the facts, at least the best that we can
18 do in presenting what we know about the site;
19 prohibitions and tasks, which is the next most important
20 thing; provisions and self-monitoring program. We're
21 going to focus on the tasks now.

22 The tasks of the Presidio Site Order or the
Page 6

23 Presidio Tentative SCR focus on the petroleum sites, as
24 I said. And probably the biggest task is the task that
25 requires a time schedule. I'll step back for a second.

8

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 What the Order does is that it doesn't change anything
2 that's been done in the past, really. It builds upon
3 what the Army has done and what the Presidio and the
4 Park Service has carried forward in its program. It
5 really just puts it into a time frame that we can better
6 manage. So it requires a generation of time schedule,
7 and it provides flexibility there in that the Trust,
8 working with the Park Service and the regulators, will
9 establish their own delivery dates and compliance dates.

10 (INAUDIBLE) will be incorporated into the order.
11 It requires a generation of freshwater
12 point-of-compliance concentrations for extractable-range
13 hydrocarbons, diesel range, fuel oil. Those numbers are
14 lacking in the freshwater corridor for Tennessee Hollow,
15 the Tennessee Hollow corridor. And it requires
16 Corrective Action Plans for sites that have groundwater
17 impacts for petroleum releases, and it calls for a
18 Mini-Corrective Action Plan Site at sites that only have
19 soil contamination from gasoline and petroleum releases.
20 Then at the end, it requires site close-out
21 certification so that we can get it on the books.

22 Written responses for the SCR should be received in
23 our office by June 16, 2003. It can be directed to me.
24 The Tentative Order is on our website at this web
25 address. It falls under the Presidio header. It's a

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 PTF file. I can send people copies if they choose, hard
2 copies. I think hard copies went to the RAB chair,
3 Co-chair, and to the interested parties. And please,
4 you can always call me and E-mail me with your
5 questions.

6 I would just like to close by saying that I would
7 appreciate any of the comments you do have on the Order;
8 anything that I can do to improve it. What I'll do is
9 after I receive written comments, I'll respond to those
10 comments, and I will bring this into work before our
11 nine governor-appointed Board on July 16, 2003.

12 The Board hearing begins at 9:00 a.m. at the Elihu
13 Harris Building in Oakland. And if the Board adopts the
14 Order, based on staff's recommendation and the
15 recommendation of our Executive Officer at that time,
16 then the existing Presidio orders, which are outdated,
17 will be rescinded, and the new Order will kick in and it
18 will go into effect. So I'm open to any questions.
19 That's basically my presentation in a nutshell.

20 MR. KERN: Questions for Jim.

21 MR. BERMAN: Just a clarification. Was that
22 an underline in the website between tentative and Order?
23 I couldn't quite make it out. Why don't you run back
24 two slides? Here it is. Is that an underline between
25 the word tentative and Order?

10

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. PONTON: I don't know. If you were to
2 just get to this part of it, you'll see our web page and

3 then you'll see Presidio Tentative Order right under
4 that. So you can click on that. I think that might be
5 a glitch. I tried it and it worked pretty well.

6 MR. KERN: Jim, on the Board meeting, do you
7 see any need for public members to testify to that, or
8 is it pretty much approved, or what do you recommend?

9 MR. PONTON: Well, we always hope that we can
10 craft something that everyone agrees with. That's the
11 best situation. I really would recommend that you read
12 through it. And if anyone feels that their comments
13 haven't been adequately addressed by staff, by me, or by
14 our agency, or they feel that their issues aren't being
15 handled, that they have an opportunity to submit a card
16 and stand before the Board in front of the auditorium
17 and to give their opinion. I really hope that we get it
18 to the point that everyone agrees that it's the right
19 way to go. It's inclusive and correct and factually
20 correct and workable. And then it would be an
21 uncontested item where the Board would just adopt it as
22 part of the bigger package. So there would be no
23 presentations and really no reason to testify. So the
24 goal is to get it uncontested and get it in a state
25 where everyone is happy. But there is always the

11

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 opportunity to testify or to give a presentation.

2 MR. BERMAN: Can you just highlight what is
3 really different in this order than the existing Order?

4 MR. PONTON: Well, this Order requires --
5 basically the biggest difference in this Order is the
6 named responsible parties on the Order. In the past,

7 the Order named only the Army. This Order now names the
8 Presidio Trust and the Park Service. Actually, the
9 Department of the Interior.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: And the Army.

11 MR. PONTON: And the Army, right. All three
12 parties. That is the most significant difference.
13 That's probably the most -- that's usually the most
14 difficult part of an Order is who you are going to name
15 as being responsible on there. So that's the biggest
16 difference, I'd say.

17 The tasks that are in the Order, I've kind of
18 reversed them already with the Trust. They're basically
19 what everyone is planning to do now, anyway. It's
20 keeping with the order of the sites that have been
21 studied. It really doesn't require anything more. It
22 just requires them to be put into a schedule that's
23 manageable and predictable.

24 MR. COOPER: Jim, so comments are due June 16.
25 The hearing is July 16. What's the mechanism that will

12

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 be used so we'll know how our comments are being
2 addressed before the hearing? You said it would be nice
3 by July 16 to have all the comments worked out.

4 MR. PONTON: What I did for Hamilton, when I
5 worked with Hamilton is I wrote up a response to each
6 and every comment, made the appropriate changes in the
7 text, and then we conferenced-called the person who made
8 the comments with the responsive comments to see if they
9 were happy with that. And then we did a red-line strike
10 out and sent it back out.

11 So that's how I've done it in the past. It's a
12 very open process. Basically, I read the comments and
13 I try to make the adjustments. Sometimes the adjustment
14 is recommended by the person commenting. It might be a
15 factual -- I might have got the comment wrong or got the
16 number wrong on a finding. And then we go over that
17 with the person who has made the comments and make sure
18 that they are satisfied.

19 MR. COOPER: Thirty days is enough time? Is
20 that typical?

21 MR. PONTON: Typically we give a 30-day window
22 or less for reviews. This one is longer. Hopefully 30
23 days should be enough.

24 MR. COOPER: So the sooner we send in comments
25 the sooner you can start to decide how you want to

13

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 address the issues and talk to us about it.

2 MR. PONTON: Right. There will be some
3 interaction through our legal department as well.

4 MS. CHEEVER: I just wanted to clarify. You
5 say that it focuses on petroleum sites. Is it
6 comprehensive on all possible water sites in the
7 Presidio; for instance, the ones that are addressed in
8 the Feasibility Study like Mountain Lake and Lobos Creek
9 that aren't petroleum sites that are water bodies, or
10 what?

11 MR. PONTON: Right. That's a good question.
12 What happens is that the Order -- the Order calls out
13 the Petroleum Program specifically, but whether it's the
14 DTSC or the Water Board or the Federal EPA, whoever

15 reports on the site, when cleanups are done, they have
16 to consider all of the regulations of all the agencies.
17 So even if Mountain Lake or another water body doesn't
18 appear to be included, Mountain Lake is designated in
19 this document as having a potential beneficial use of
20 municipal drinking, so it would have to be cleaned up to
21 background or drinking water standards. So typically in
22 the cleanups, the agency that's leading the cleanups,
23 that would be DTSC, those are called ARARs. So either
24 the Order or the Water Code, these things would have to
25 be considered in terms of developing the cleanup numbers

14

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 that would be proposed for those sites. So indirectly
2 it's included into the process, if not directly. That
3 is a good comments, whether or not it should be included
4 at other sites.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Or in petroleum waters.

6 MR. PONTON: But generally the DTSC has that
7 wrapped up.

8 MR. BOGGS: We both work under the same Cal
9 EPA. They are two agencies within a bigger agency. He
10 said it correctly. My agency is taking the lead. I
11 have to consider all their regs, and his agency is
12 taking the lead, and they have to consider our regs.
13 It's kind of the way it's been set up at most former
14 military facilities is petroleum issues and water issues
15 are led by the Water Board and other hazardous waste
16 type-issues are dealt with by DTSC.

17 MR. SEELBACKPONTON: Right. Under Cal EPA
18 there is the DTSC; there is the Water Board; there is

19 the Department of Pesticide Regulation; Integrated Waste
20 Management Board, and the Air Board. There are six
21 agencies. We are all part of a big umbrella agency. So
22 all of those requirements have to be considered when
23 developing cleanup numbers or taking actions or
24 (INAUDIBLE) provisions to fall back on.

25 Now that I'm thinking about it, the other

15

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 significant difference in this Order that I think is
2 significant -- which anyone can disagree with if they
3 feel that there is a different way to go -- currently
4 the Presidio puts out quarterly monitoring reports that
5 are huge. I've asked that this quarter that it be
6 reduced to semi-annually. I think we could save a
7 significant amount of money.

8 It's a pretty good handle on what the groundwater
9 issues are at the site. There's no big surprises right
10 now. It would be with the understanding that if there
11 was significant -- that monitoring would be continued
12 quarterly but the reporting would be semi-annually.
13 That would free up some money and free up some time.
14 And also we can agree that if there is a significant
15 occurrence, we would be notified by some type of letter
16 in the interim.

17 That's another significant difference from the
18 existing Order. That's something that DTSC may think is
19 not appropriate or someone may feel that's
20 inappropriate, but I feel it's appropriate given the
21 data set, and what's known about water quality at the
22 site so far. I thought that would be a big money

23 savin gs.

24 MR. SUTTER: I have another question for Jim
25 and Bob. It's kind of speculative. Is the budget

16

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 crisis in California -- are your agencies being slated
2 for any hits that you know of that would affect your
3 ability to do your work here at the Presidio?

4 MR. PONTON: Our management tries not to alarm
5 staff. We've never had a layoff at the Water Board in
6 its history. It's existed many, many years under
7 different names before the '60s. But that can change.
8 Our agency had to identify a 10 percent reduction in
9 staff which could affect -- that's based on seniority.
10 In the past, the unions have accommodated those
11 reductions through pay cuts or deferring raises. That
12 possibly might be something that they think of this time
13 or furloughs. But I would say that even if I am not on
14 the project, that someone would certainly carry on, that
15 this process would continue forward even if I'm not
16 there. They would replace me with someone else more
17 senior if I was to be let go. That's my opinion. This
18 process will go forward.

19 The Presidio funds us. The Presidio funds the
20 position basically. I don't use that position. I use
21 maybe a quarter of it, or half of it. I work at other
22 sites. But somebody else can pick it up at that point.

23 MR. BOGGS: Similarly with my agency, it's
24 kind of a dichotomy. My agency is a lot like Jim's
25 department. It's what they call special funding. We

17

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 get voluntary cleanup agreements, so my time gets billed
2 to the Presidio Trust. So it doesn't affect the State
3 budget at all. However, from the Department of
4 Personnel, my agency too has been told to find a
5 10 percent staff reduction, even though it's not going
6 to affect the State General Fund essentially at all
7 because we are actually a money-making agency. So
8 similarly, although we're expected to either have to
9 give in on salary decreases, etc., or a staff reduction,
10 somebody will be in this position, and I'm walking the
11 border line on seniority.

12 MR. PONTON: Even beyond that, there is always
13 the chance that one of us will be transferred to other
14 group because of our background, and you would have a
15 new case worker. I think that's probably one of the
16 longest ones on here for a while.

17 The other thing this Order tends to do is tidy
18 things up. It's everything from a current snapshot of
19 where we are and where we need to go.

20 MR. COOPER: Can I add something to the
21 layoff? Even though we pay the oversight cost of Jim
22 and Bob, it doesn't mean that the State budget situation
23 seems to be disconnected from the fact that the Presidio
24 Trust pays its oversight bills, which is a little
25 frustrating from my perspective. It seems like if a

18

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 party fully pays oversight bills, then we should pay the
2 full FTE. But I know it's different that way. The
3 State is in financial jam. They're cutting costs in a

4 different way.

5 Secondly, on the subject of layoffs, Presidio Trust
6 has announced that we are going to do layoffs this year
7 also. That percentage of a staff reduction keeps moving
8 around. So stay tuned. I think the actual
9 announcements of who's going to be laid off could come
10 as early as June. Hopefully no one will get laid off in
11 the Environmental Remediation Department.

12 MR. KERN: Jim, just one more question. You
13 mentioned in addition to the Army, the Trust and the
14 Park Service that are named in the Order, would it be
15 appropriate to discuss whether the Agency's like that
16 now, or are you having discussions with them already?

17 MR. PONTON: I don't think anyone wants to be
18 named to anything, really. But the Legal Department --
19 I'll let Brian and Craig answer that.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Park Service has already
21 expressed concern about being named on the Order because
22 of the additional risk that it puts our Park Service
23 under; things that we believed that under the MOA that
24 was entered into with the Trust and the Army, that we
25 are not subject to at this point.

19

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 And the way we feel is that is we're not -- we're
2 submitting that we managed the land for a period of
3 time, but under the Regional Board's Model Order, there
4 are opportunities to put it in a second class of
5 dischargers, acknowledging that we were in a certain
6 position for a certain period of time, but that one of
7 the other dischargers is cooperating, has adequate

8 funding and is making the avenues to do the work.

9 If we are unable to convince the Board that we
10 should be put into a lesser classification of
11 discharger, then we're going to be asking the Trust to
12 work somehow to set aside money to help protect our
13 position, somewhere near a hundred million dollars, so
14 that we don't take any additional risks in this process.
15 And what sort of burden that will be on the program
16 right now, I can't say. It's not going to be a trivial
17 task.

18 MR. COOPER: From my side, well, we've thought
19 it over, I think from a preliminary perspective, I think
20 the Board is right. From a legal perspective, the Trust
21 is a current owner. The Park Service was a previous
22 owner-operator, and the Army was owner and discharger.

23 And again, our official comments were written down
24 in writing. I think our preliminary thought is we at
25 the Presidio Trust, we are the primary respondent. I

20

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 think maybe respondent might be the appropriate term to
2 call us. We are going to be responding to this Order
3 and sending the money out of the Trust Fund to respond
4 to the Order. And having other parties named, just from
5 my experience, who don't have a financial
6 responsibility -- and I know that the Regional Board
7 doesn't really care how the cost sharing is done, but I
8 wanted to share my own personal perspective -- the Army
9 and the Park Service, because we've done site agreements
10 with them about the cost sharing, who's financially
11 responsible and who isn't, and if they're named right up

12 there, my concern is that the Park Service and the Army
13 might have an elevated role in how the response should
14 be. They're not paying for it, but they will be telling
15 me in a more direct way on how to prepare the work plans
16 and how to respond, and it may not be in a most
17 cost-effective fashion, but I think it's appropriate.

18 So that's my preliminary off-the-cuff response, and
19 we'll put our comments together in writing, and
20 hopefully we can work something out. Because overall,
21 the Order -- I can't really see any major concerns.
22 It's just what Jim said. It's pretty much what we're
23 doing anyway, putting it all in one consolidated Order,
24 putting some order to it and some logic to it, so it's
25 really clear about what is the Trust responsible to do.

21

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 I think that's really important.

2 I think the Order is a great idea. Now it's just a
3 matter of the attorney sorting out what makes sense as
4 far as the legal part, on who would get (INAUDIBLE).

5 MR. BERMAN: This is kind of an interesting
6 discussion about responsibility. I have two minor
7 questions. One is do you expect to hear from the Army
8 at all on this? The Army, they've been a previous
9 discharger, so you would expect that you would hear from
10 them. The question is do you actually think the Army
11 will respond at all between now and July 16th?

12 MR. PONTON: I do. It went out certified mail
13 to the acting director to the Park Service, the director
14 of the Trust and to the commander, a Colonel at the
15 Army. So it's been received. I sent a copy to Bruce

16 Handle (PHONETIC). I spoke to him and found out who to
17 direct it to. I think the Army will respond. The Order
18 very, very, clearly specifies and states that the Army
19 is responsible for the releases and the contamination
20 there. They are primarily responsible for what's
21 happened in their operation to property over the 150
22 years that they had it.

23 They may argue that they paid a settlement to be
24 rid of that responsibility, but we will recognize that.
25 That can be a comment made and an issue raised. I

22

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 really seriously doubt that the Army would not be named
2 to the Order given that they created the condition of
3 pollution that is going to be remedied in the future, or
4 they contributed to it. I'm talking water-word talk
5 right now. I'm talking about conditions of pollution,
6 dischargers and responsible parties. Right now, all
7 three agencies are listed as responsible parties. I
8 think they'll respond.

9 MS. BLUM: Is there any concern that the
10 insurance money that they have for cleanup levels is in
11 any jeopardy?

12 MR. PONTON: No. Any site agreements or any
13 agreements that have been reached between different
14 agencies as to how the site work will be done, I can't
15 really take that into consideration when I propose the
16 responsible parties.

17 In terms of the insurance monies, I think in a lot
18 of ways by putting the Petroleum Program on a schedule,
19 it will help plan for the monies that exist, and it will

20 help dedicate those monies for the cleanups that are
21 necessary in light of all the other things that are
22 happening at the site. So I think it's only going to
23 help the situation by creating a better understanding of
24 both the time budget and probably a financial budget.

25 And also there is not a lot of significant

23

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 petroleum issues at the site that are going to require
2 massive corrective action. So far, what I've seen, what
3 is being proposed at the site, a lot of it will probably
4 need some (INAUDIBLE) of booms. I'm not really sure.
5 But there are no mile-long MPB booms here. There are
6 other issues that are going to require, from what I can
7 see, active remediation systems that are going to be
8 very costly. I'm trying to reduce monitoring and
9 reporting so that we can save some money and accommodate
10 and to be able to do other things at the site. So I am
11 sensitive to that, but I can't really change my
12 direction based on the fact that there is an insurance
13 policy or any other agreements.

14 MR. COOPER: And Jan, to answer your question
15 on the insurance side, my understanding is if it's work
16 required by the Regional Board or DTSC it becomes an
17 allowable expenditure. Also I have to contact Zurich
18 and give them a copy of the Order, and if there's any
19 new work, get that endorsed through endorsements, under
20 our cost overrun insurance policy. But Zurich generally
21 hasn't had a problem with anything that's been required
22 by the regulatory agencies. It will become an allowable
23 expenditure.

24 And again, I don't see any new work. I think you
25 mentioned cleanup levels. Those two outstanding

24

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 freshwater ecological protection zone cleanup levels,
2 cleanup levels have always been missing. The Army did
3 not put those together. So it's been something that we
4 knew that we needed to do all along, and now it's really
5 clear because there it is as a task in the Order.

6 MR. PONTON: As I understand it, I think the
7 Presidio is already moving forward with developing those
8 efforts. There is really nothing new, no new
9 requirements basically capturing the momentum of this
10 time and preserving that and creating a timeline for the
11 future to make sure that it all gets taken care of.

12 MR. KERN: Okay. Good. Thanks again, Jim.
13 Let's move on to Item 5B, the CERCLA Project Updates.

14 MR. COOPER: All right. Moving along. I
15 think everybody knows who I am. With me tonight I want
16 to introduce Ryan Seelback. He is an environmental
17 scientist, Remediation Project Manager at the Presidio
18 Trust. I've going to go talk over the first couple of
19 slides in our presentation tonight, and then Ryan is
20 going to talk about some of the projects he's working
21 on.

22 I think everybody knows that. I don't know if
23 you've met Ryan before? No? How long have you been at
24 the Trust, Ryan?

25 MR. SEELBACK: Two years.

25

1 MR. COOPER: He was hired six months before I
2 was hired. I've been there a year and a half. One of
3 my new initiatives is to bring other people from the
4 Trust's remediation staff to RAB meetings, do little
5 presentations to get to know you all. Because they meet
6 Jim and Bob, but you're an important stakeholder also.
7 This is really the best forum, this and the committee
8 meetings are the best forum to get to know you guys,
9 hear what kind of questions you ask and to better put
10 together work plans and reports for all of our
11 stakeholders. Maybe next month you will meet yet
12 another project remediation project manager from the
13 Trust.

14 The first thing I'm going to talk about real
15 briefly -- the main thing I'm going to talk about is the
16 firing range's operable units. That's something I don't
17 think we've talked about in detail in a long time, if at
18 all. It is a project that Chris is working on, but I
19 know it well enough. Between Brian and I, I think we
20 can get through it.

21 But before we get to the firing ranges, I want to
22 give you just real briefly the Revised Feasibility
23 Study. As you know, in the street, you guys are looking
24 at it. Everybody is looking at it.

25 Over at the Public Health Service Hospital, Landfill

26

1 8 and Landfill 10, we are putting together our 5 Year
2 Review report. That should be ready for the regulatory
3 agencies and the RAB in about 30 days.

4 Landfill E, as you know, we did a big
5 investigation/characterization study late last year. We
6 are now putting together the data report associated with
7 that investigation. And we got some comments from
8 Brian, and we are going to revise that report internally
9 and hopefully maybe within 20 -- Chris put that. I
10 think that might be a little optimistic. Maybe 20, 30
11 days we'll get that report out to the stakeholders also.
12 Those documents are chugging along.

13 Just a brief footnote on Landfill E. I know that
14 that's a really important project to the RAB. The next
15 step after the data report is to do the Feasibility
16 Study for Landfill E. We're preparing a scope of work.
17 We're going to bring on a new contractor to do our
18 feasibility Study for Landfill E. It's just basically a
19 fresh look, and someone that hasn't actually worked on
20 the Presidio. That would be my preference. Just comes
21 in with a completely fresh look on all the paths
22 investigation that's gone on here. So stay tuned on
23 that

24 MR. BERMAN: Can I interrupt with a question?
25 At the committee meeting, not the last one but the one

27

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 before, the committee meeting maybe in February, there
2 were several tidbits of discussion about this sampling
3 report made by various people at that time. I don't
4 think we prepared anything written. I was wondering
5 whether some of those comments are going to be
6 considered in your overview or review of the EKI work?

7 MR. COOPER: I'm trying to remember. That was

8 a ways back. I think I typed them up. Did I E-mail
9 those out? This is what we heard from the committee
10 report. That definitely got sent to EKI a long time
11 ago. I'll take a look at those the second time before
12 we finalize that report and make sure.

13 Anything else? So firing ranges we're going to
14 talk about tonight, so stay tuned. Mountain Lake. It's
15 a project in the Feasibility Study. As we talked about
16 a little bit before, we know that the design for that is
17 going to be complicated. It's kind of a long
18 discussion. I'm not going to go over it. But basically
19 our contractor is Yoras (PHONETIC) -- our design
20 contractor at Mountain Lake. They are doing some
21 preliminary design work to better figure out how we're
22 going to excavate the contaminated sediments, in a
23 nutshell. So we know it's going to be a complicated
24 remedy, the construction aspect of it, so we wanted to
25 start looking on the RD in advance. We'll have a

28

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 preliminary RD -- I don't want to put a timeframe on
2 it -- but it's something that we'll definitely share
3 with regulatory agencies and check in with everybody
4 before we go any further. But before we have anything,
5 we've got to get our thoughts together first, and then
6 we'll present that to everybody and check in.

7 MR. KERN: Is that a signal that you guys are
8 going to maybe proceed once you have your remedial
9 design to actually doing something, given all the issues
10 with Caltrans and all that? Is this okay to ask?

11 MR. COOPER: It's okay to ask. You can ask

12 anything. I did get the remedial design endorsed
13 through Zurich. Working on a remedial design is an
14 allowable expenditure. I'm not getting ahead of myself
15 with the insurance company. But the endorsement went
16 just as far as the remedial design. It did not include
17 remedial action at this point in time. There you have
18 it. I can't say at this point.

19 MS. CHEEVER: When you say endorsed, what do
20 you mean?

21 MR. COOPER: Endorsed means it becomes part of
22 the insured product -- when we spend money on it, part
23 of that hundred million becomes an allowable
24 expenditure. And remember that when we did that
25 presentation that we need a hundred million dollars of

29

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 allowable expenditures before the cost overrun insurance
2 kicks in? So making sure things get endorsed is
3 important because only endorsed work products, endorsed
4 projects, money that we spend on endorsed projects are
5 allowable expenditures. So not to segue too far into
6 the insurance arena.

7 MR. SUTTER: In the remedial design, I think
8 there was a discussion months ago about this. Will you
9 include the relocation or correction of the Highway 1
10 drainage situation? Is that part of the remedial
11 design?

12 MR. COOPER: That is definitely on our agenda.
13 I wish Chris was here, but I think we are making it part
14 of our remedial design. I think that's something that
15 we're definitely taking a look at, cost-sharing

16 opportunities with other parties, certainly for that
17 part of the work. But yes, that definitely can be part
18 of the remediation. We certainly don't want to clean up
19 the lake and have it become recontaminated by the storm
20 outfall.

21 On Baker Beach 3, 4, and Fill Site 6, 8 RAP, that
22 is moving along. The Trust is basically doing final
23 edits to that document. We think that we're going to
24 get that document out to the regulators and the
25 stakeholders by the end of May, if everything goes

30

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 right. I have put together a proposed plan. That's a
2 little fact sheet that we mail out to the larger
3 audience. We'll send that to the Park Service soon. I
4 hope to get that to the DTSC by the end of May. If all
5 goes well, we hope to start the Public Comment Period
6 before the end of June. I'd be really happy if we get
7 the ad in the paper and the proposed plan in the mail
8 and get things going before the end of June. So that
9 means the public meeting would be sometime in July.
10 That's where we're shooting for right now.

11 As we discussed a little bit before, we've had our
12 50 percent design workshop on these three cleanup
13 projects. As you know, they're all clean-closure
14 cleanups with the regulators with Jim and Bob. And
15 those went well. We're putting together some notes from
16 those meetings. Someone from the RAB was able to attend
17 the 6/8 meeting.

18 MS. TRIGIANI: When was that? April 29th was
19 the schedule. I thought it had been moved.

20 MR. COOPER: May 7th. We didn't send out a
21 reminder?
22 MS. TRIGIANI: No. I didn't get one.
23 MR. KERN: It could be that just Mark and I
24 got the update -- it would be our responsibility. We
25 didn't send it on.

31

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Sorry about that.
2 MS. TRIGIANI: Okay. So you're going to be
3 sending --
4 MR. COOPER: We got some informal meeting
5 notes, action items, things to consider. I just have it
6 by E-mail from the contractor today. I'm taking a look
7 at it, and I'll send it out to Mark and Doug and they
8 can distribute it, or I can send it to you directly if
9 you want.
10 MS. TRIGIANI: No, Doug and I already talked
11 about it.
12 MR. COOPER: Nothing really new or different.
13 It's kind of what we discussed before. Oh, another
14 thing, to help us -- I've also, about a week or so ago,
15 signed a permanent request to do artist renditions of
16 what these sites will look like when we're done. That
17 was a real struggle last year when we went out and did
18 our meetings, and people asked, "What's this going to
19 look like when you're all done?" Through the planning
20 department, I signed a procurement request for 6A and
21 Baker Beach 3 on what we think they will basically look
22 like, three, four, five years down the road, once the
23 landfill's been dug out and plants have been put in,

24 etc. So I will definitely share that with everybody
25 here too.

32

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Okay. We need to start construction on Baker Beach
2 3 before the rains. We've talked about that. 6A should
3 start in the winter, and it should be okay.

4 Landfill 4 as you all know is all done. Trees are
5 planted. Good shape. Fill Site 5. Done. Great shape.
6 I think we've got some pictures here. That's what Fill
7 Site 5 looks like right now. We're laying down erosion
8 control fabric. It's a pretty interesting process.

9 We're putting together our construction completion
10 reports compiling all of the history of all of the
11 excavation work, confirmation soil sampling. All that
12 report is being put together. The groundwater
13 monitoring wells at both sites have been put in. We've
14 sampled at 4. We're going to sample at 5 in a couple of
15 weeks as one of our routine's quarterly rounds. Then we
16 can finalize those completion reports and send them to
17 the right regulatory agencies.

18 MR. SUTTER: Budget-wise, how did Fill Site 5
19 end up?

20 MR. COOPER: I owe you -- under budget, I can
21 say that. And I owe you those back-up pages. It's just
22 on our To-Do list. I only gave you a summary sheet at
23 the last committee meeting. I need to do the back-up
24 pages, and then we can get a really good accounting of
25 how Fill Site 5 did, and Landfill 4, and how much under

33

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700
Page 28

1 budget we are from both the construction and the
2 engineering perspective. I think engineering kind of
3 came in line with the original cost estimate. The
4 construction I think for 4 was a little high; 5 was low,
5 and I think we overall saved a little bit of money. But
6 stay turned. Certainly by the next committee meeting, I
7 think I'll have those back-up pages and give you more
8 details on that.

9 Firing ranges. We're starting yet another operable
10 unit. As you know, the Feasibility Study that we keep
11 talking about, that's the Main Installation Site
12 Operable Unit Feasibility Study. At the Presidio, we
13 have a total of nine operable units. Operable units are
14 just a grouping of remediation sites. Some operable
15 units might have three sites in it; some might have 39
16 sites, like the Main Installation Operable Unit is just
17 huge. Anyway, the firing ranges is another operable
18 unit. It's another grouping of sites. And usually you
19 kind of group them by commonality. So this one is --
20 all the sites in the firing range's operable unit are
21 former firing ranges.

22 I'm going to briefly talk about a little bit of
23 project history; what's going on with this operable
24 unit; where we are right now as far as investigating and
25 cleaning up this operable unit site; what are our

34

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 chemicals of concern, and where are we going?

2 So the Army back in '97, they did that very, very
3 early first stage in the CERCLA process is that site
4 investigation where you go out and try to figure out

5 whether you have a problem or not. So they went out and
6 checked eight former small firing ranges. Just very
7 preliminary investigations. Not very comprehensive.

8 What was decided at that point in time, the Army
9 put four of those firing ranges into the Crissy Field
10 RAP. So those four firing ranges already have a final
11 decision document for them in the Crissy Field RAP, and
12 they've been addressed through that RAP cleanup process.

13 Then the other four, plus we found another one
14 along the way, the Barnard Avenue Range, got put into
15 the firing range's operable unit RI/FS. So we have five
16 sites, former firing ranges sites in this operable unit.

17 Now we need to basically investigate them more
18 thoroughly. And the way to do that is through something
19 called a RI/FS Work Plan, a Remedial Investigation
20 Feasibility Study Work Plan. And that document has been
21 made publicly available, and that's what I'm going to
22 talk about a little bit more right now in a little bit
23 more detail and kind of orient everyone to this RI/FS
24 Work Plan.

25 So there is five sites in it. They will be

35

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 evaluated first through sampling and testing those
2 sites, soil sampling, and then we'll do a Feasibility
3 Study for those five sites to decide what the best
4 remedy is. Three of the sites are located in Area A
5 (Park Service territory) and two are in Area B. Those
6 are the names of the sites. I've got a map coming up
7 here in a second to show you where they're located.

8 Basically, the last bullet talks about chemical

9 screening and risk evaluation similar to Trust Revised
10 FS process. Same type thing. We've identified COCs.
11 We have a Cleanup Levels Document. We will compare the
12 contaminants that we find in this soil at these five
13 firing ranges and compare to it to our Presidio Cleanup
14 levels and decide where the problems are, and where
15 there is unacceptable risk that needs a cleanup.

16 Okay. Let's see if I can do this. There is five
17 of them that are in the Firing Range's RFS. First,
18 let's do the Area A sites. There is one here, two in
19 Lobos Creek area, one here and one here. And then the
20 third one in Area A is the CHP Pistol Range over here.

21 Okay. So those are the three sites in Area A.

22 The two sites in Area B are Barnard Avenue. As you
23 know, most of it sits right underneath Landfill E. And
24 then the third one is Machine Gun Butt. It's located
25 right there.

36

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 So those are the five sites that we want to
2 investigate more thoroughly. And based on the type of
3 contaminants, the activities that happened at these
4 firing ranges, basically shooting and the preliminary
5 information we got from the Army, we've identified our
6 Chemicals of Concern. Primarily it's lead with zinc and
7 barium and antimony, lead that's spent from the
8 ammunition. And that's our primary Chemical of Concern.
9 And sometimes copper. But basically when we sample,
10 we're going to be testing for all priority metals at
11 least in a certain number of our tests. We'll be
12 looking for all priority metals in a lot of our samples.

13 So what's our strategy in this RFS Work Plan?

14 Well, basically we want to better define the nature and
15 extent of the soil contamination at each of the five
16 firing ranges. We have some data already from the Army,
17 but there's data gaps there. It's not really clear. We
18 need to go out and take more samples, and figure out
19 where the areas of exceedance are; where are cleanup
20 levels exceeding? The Army didn't do a very good
21 characterization at depth. So we don't know if it's
22 just in the first top six inches or is this
23 contamination down a foot deep or two-feet deep? So we
24 need to take some samples at depth to get a better
25 vertical characterization, and sample in areas where the

37

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Army didn't sample. We're going to be much more
2 rigorous in our sampling strategy. Our grid spacing is
3 proposed to be much tighter than what the Army did. So
4 we won't miss anything hopefully.

5 So again, we want to fill in data gaps. There was
6 problems with the antimony detection limit in the old
7 Army investigation. The Army used a hand-held fill
8 device called an XRF. We need to confirm some of the
9 results from that, and actually take some soil samples
10 where the XRF was used.

11 There was some concerns about the way the Army took
12 soil samples, and we want to fix that. Again, copper
13 detection limits were a problem in the old Army
14 sampling. So basically kind of fixing a lot of problems
15 in the old Army reports and just getting a better handle
16 on what the soil contamination problems are.

17 So again, there is a total of five sites. All five
18 sites added together, we have 189 sample locations. A
19 lot of these locations we're going to be sampling the
20 depth. We're going to take a total of 415 samples from
21 a depth from the ground surface, 4 inches, which is
22 really a ground surface sample, to up to 4 feet deep.
23 And we want to do the sampling this summer. And the
24 field work will take about a month. And there will be a
25 data report, basically an RI report that comes out of

38

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 this that is publicly available. And then after we get
2 that done, the next step would be to do the FS. They're
3 coming out together. It will be an RI/FS report all in
4 one document. Any questions on that operable unit?

5 MS. BLUM: On the Landfill E, where it's
6 something like 33 feet deep, what was Barnard Firing
7 Range? What level was that?

8 MR. COOPER: It's underneath the landfill.

9 MS. BLUM: You're only going to go 4 feet when
10 you hit the firing range.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: The work is not going to be
12 done under Landfill E. If you look at the Landfill E
13 work, part of that work was to look at the bottom of the
14 fill because the firing range occurred first on the
15 surface, and then the fill was placed on it. The Firing
16 Range RI/FS was focused on the area of Barnard Avenue
17 range that is not under Landfill E.

18 MS. BLUM: Okay.

19 MR. COOPER: So actually we've already
20 investigated part of the Barnard Avenue Range through

21 our Landfill E Characterization Study sample down there
22 for all these Chemicals of Concern, the lead and
23 priority metals.

24 MS. TRIGIANI: Craig, when you do the
25 sampling, that is done by a consultant, right?

39

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Oh, yeah.

2 MS. TRIGIANI: Okay. Is that a process that
3 goes out to bid to do that work, or is that something
4 that the Trust can just hire somebody to do?

5 MR. COOPER: Good question. You're thinking
6 because we're taking so many samples this time --

7 MS. TRIGIANI: No. I'm just trying to get my
8 arms around what types of jobs require bids and what are
9 up to your discretion.

10 MR. COOPER: Right. Typically, for smaller
11 sampling events -- for example, Treadwell and Rollo is
12 our consultant who wrote the RFS Work Plan. If they
13 continue on, they would be our consultants who would be
14 doing oversight of the soil sampling. They would most
15 likely subcontract it out with their oversight.

16 MR. ULLENSVANG: Craig, I think what some of
17 the new members don't have is your main consultants
18 right now were each acquired through a proposal process.
19 So there was a competitive process that all the
20 contractors, including Treadwell and Rollo, they bid
21 (INAUDIBLE) contracts. So the Trust can then just ask
22 for one of the current contractors that are in the
23 current proposal, as long as it's within the initial
24 scope. Something like this is clearly within the scope.

25 MS. TRIGIANI: Okay. Thank you.

40

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. PONTON: Are you doing any leaching tests
2 on the soil samples?

3 MR. COOPER: I don't think in the RFS Work
4 Plan we are. Oh, yes, we are.

5 MS. SHIPMAN: Yeah. There is a provision to
6 do some STLC --

7 MR. COOPER: For a certain percentage of the
8 samples?

9 MS. SHIPMAN: Yeah. We exceed the TTLCs.

10 MR. COOPER: Good for us. I thought that
11 would be the next step, but we're doing it all at once,
12 which is fine. Any other questions on the Firing
13 Ranges?

14 We basically want to sit down -- Bob of DTSC is the
15 lead regulatory agency on that operable unit, and we
16 hope to schedule a meeting with him and Jim first week
17 of June and go over the Work Plan in a lot more detail
18 and get their approval sometime soon so we can go out
19 and take the soil samples and fill these data gaps.

20 MR. KERN: Do you have a ballpark estimate so
21 people can understand what an investigation like this
22 might cost? 5 sites. 400 samples. Are we talking
23 \$20,000? \$500,000?

24 MR. COOPER: What's the priority metals? Do
25 you know just ballpark, Dorinda?

41

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MS. SHIPMAN: Well, just to kind of answer a
2 question that was raised before, for the analytical and
3 sampling tasks, those did go out to bid to different
4 contractors, so that was competitively billed, the
5 analytical work.

6 MR. COOPER: Treadwell sent it out
7 competitively for subcontractors.

8 MS. SHIPMAN: We sent it out to three
9 subcontractors for each service and chose the most
10 competitive one who could provide the right services.

11 I'm not sure if I remember. In each individual
12 metal, where we're doing just the COCs, which are the
13 five or six metals, those are between \$5 and \$10 each.
14 I think the full metal scans is about \$125 to \$150. And
15 we're doing 10 percent of the samples for the whole
16 scan, metal scan, just to make sure that we've gotten
17 the appropriate COCs. I don't know if I can recall the
18 total investigation cost off the top of my head.

19 MR. COOPER: At least a hundred thousand?

20 MS. TRIGIANI: It would be really helpful if
21 you could just throw up a slide during something like
22 this that gives us the dollar figure, and then the
23 context of where that falls in numbers we may have
24 already seen in either any existing work order or
25 whatever. I'm still trying to get my arms around a lot

42

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 of this, but that would be helpful.

2 MR. COOPER: Yeah. That's fair enough. I
3 should at least be knowledgeable enough to ballpark it,
4 and we are, but just for the sampling alone, we're

5 ball parking about a hundred thousand.

6 MS. TRIGIANI: Okay. Did it create a lot of
7 extra work that they have a slide in here with the
8 numbers on it?

9 MR. COOPER: Well, exact cost estimate, I
10 think that wouldn't be good, but we could certainly
11 ballpark. I think that's really what you're looking
12 for, right? Is it 5,000 or is it 100,000? That's not
13 too much work.

14 MS. SHIPMAN: That number also includes things
15 like surveying. Because we're sampling around previous
16 sampling locations, we have to go out and locate all the
17 previous samples using survey coordinates. Data
18 validation is included in there. A lot of things that
19 go into just the sampling effort.

20 MR. KERN: Any other questions on the firing
21 range? Thank you, Craig.

22 I'm wondering Ryan, people begin to get a little
23 antsy around this time. If we can take our break just
24 before. I know you were ready. Why don't we take a
25 ten-minute break, and we'll come back for Ryan's report?

43

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 (Break taken.)

2 MR. KERN: Let us now give our full and
3 complete attention to Ryan for his initial presentation.
4 Ryan, thank you.

5 MR. SEELBACK: Thank you. Again, my name is
6 Ryan Seelback. And I'm in the Remediation Department.
7 Craig, thanks for the introduction.

8 So I'm going to talk about one of my projects,

9 Building 1065 Corrective Action Plan site. I know
10 George has discussed this area before, so I won't give
11 you any updates kind of what's going on with our
12 progress getting onto the Corrective Action Plan which
13 we're just actually starting to work on right now, which
14 is a document which is going to determine how we're
15 going to clean up the site.

16 This project I've been recently working on is an
17 Interim Action Plan. It's basically a small remediation
18 project within and before the Corrective Action. So
19 it's going to specify the petroleum cleanup activity
20 within a proposed Recycled Water Storage Tank and
21 Treatment System. And that may have occurred in a
22 meeting or two before this. So what I'm going to do is
23 discuss what's going on with the Recycled Water Storage
24 Tank and Treatment System.

25 Right now Work Plan is in draft. It's at the

44

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Regional Board and DTSC for review. We anticipate doing
2 construction in late summer.

3 This is the Building 1065 area. It's down near the
4 freeway, Doyle Drive area. You can see in the middle of
5 that site there is a proposed recycled water storage
6 tank location. That is where the Trust has chosen -- at
7 least the Engineering Department -- has chosen to put in
8 the system. I'm going to debrief you on what the system
9 is all about.

10 MR. COOPER: Everyone understand the map where
11 we're talking about?

12 MR. SEELBACK: So the goal of this project is

13 to make the Presidio more sustainable and
14 environmentally sensitive basically by reducing demands
15 on potable water supplies and impacts to wastewater
16 infrastructure. And the objective is to process the
17 wastewater generated on the Presidio and produce
18 high-quality water that's suitable for irrigation and
19 other non-potable usage.

20 One of the areas that we're trying to get this up
21 and running for as soon as possible is the Lucas
22 Development, and also Crissy Field sucks a lot of water
23 up. We're trying to get up and running for that too.

24 MR. KERN: What would the Lucas Development
25 use the water for?

45

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Grass and plant irrigation.

2 MR. SEELBACK: And same with Crissy Field.

3 It's all mostly irrigation. Any other questions?

4 So the Recycled Water Treatment System is comprised
5 of a plant, which is going to be a building adjacent to
6 the tank, and then a below-grade tank which is going to
7 store, I believe, it's 10,000 gallons. It's going to be
8 about 25 to 30 feet deep. When it's finished, it's
9 going to be a parking lot on top of it. And the
10 associated pipelines.

11 So on each side of the tank, we're going to have
12 one building supplying power to the system, and on the
13 other side of the tank is Building 1063 which is going
14 to house the plant. I also mentioned earlier that it's
15 within the 1065 Corrective Action site.

16 So our Interim Action Plan actually is a great

17 opportunity to move and treat the contaminated soil and
18 groundwater. Since the tank is going so deep, it's
19 going to require a lot of (INAUDIBLE) as well as the
20 piping around the tank.

21 So we just kind of started honing in on a place to
22 put this, and it just so happened to fall really well
23 into our cleanup site. One of the areas that's actually
24 most contaminated from underground storage tanks seems
25 to be that site on the 1065 Corrective Action.

46

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Just as a footnote, we in
2 remediation did not select the location of the Water
3 Recycling Plant. The Water Recycling Plant is being
4 managed by a different department in the Presidio Trust,
5 and they came to us and said, "Hey. Can we site our
6 Water Recycling Plant here?" This is the best place for
7 it. Brian said, "Well, the soil there is contaminated,
8 but we can work something out, maybe." And that's the
9 birthing of this Interim Action Plan basically.

10 MR. SEELBACK: And we just said it's going to
11 be totally infeasible to do any cleanup if we put a
12 system in before we can do the cleanup. So we're kind
13 of trying to rush this Interim Action through to meet
14 their recycled water schedule.

15 MS. BLUM: Who schedules? The Trust or Lucas?

16 MR. SEELBACK: It's just part of the Planning
17 Department and the Engineering Department and also tied
18 in very heavily to the Lucas work.

19 So we are proposing two remediation strategies that
20 we conducted during the interim measure, and it's going

21 to be towards the final Corrective Action we're doing up
22 there.

23 So it's going to remove contaminated soil and
24 groundwater. The soil will be excavated, and the
25 groundwater will be dewatered as kind of a normal

47

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 procedure during the installation of the tank. It will
2 then capture some of the contaminated groundwater during
3 that dewatering. And as kind of a precautionary
4 measure, when we have the excavation open, we're going
5 to place an oxygen-releasing compound in the ground to
6 enhance biodegradation of petroleum-related compounds
7 remaining in groundwater. And that's to incur any
8 excavation as well as beneath the building or the
9 treatment plant is going to be, Building 1063.

10 MR. BERMAN: How long is the ORC actually?
11 How long can it work? Could it still be effective after
12 the storage tank is in place?

13 MR. SEELBACK: Yes. It will continue to work
14 over time. It will actually take some time to get up
15 and working. It lasts six months.

16 MR. PONTON: It depends on how much
17 groundwater is flowing by it.

18 MR. SEELBACK: We're going to monitor the
19 groundwater as well during that period of time. We
20 should hopefully see a pretty rapid decay. If there is
21 residual contamination there after all the water has
22 been removed, we should see some decay and any remaining
23 contamination. Again, it's just kind of a precautionary
24 measure to be sure we've got everything.

25

MR. BERMAN: But since you're going to have

48

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 pipes going out of there, you could presumably have a
2 pipe going in and keep putting the ORC in there if you
3 didn't do it six months downstream just as well. If you
4 needed to have a longer action in there and -- because
5 once the tank is in, it's not going to be easy to work
6 on it. But the ORCs can be -- for instance, since you
7 got all that piping that's going to be there, presumably
8 you could insert a pipe in there for advanced ORC if
9 it's necessary.

10 MR. SEELBACK: Fortunately, we don't have
11 enough contamination to require that. It is a little
12 more complicated than you may be thinking of. There is
13 actually two aquifers there. There is a shallow one
14 separated by a clay layer, and there's a deeper one.

15 In the shallow one, we're hoping again to capture a
16 lot of the water that is in contact with the soil. So
17 by removing all the water and soil and putting in clean
18 soil with the ORC, that should take care of that.

19 The upper shallow groundwater and the deeper
20 groundwater is actually barely over our cleanup levels.
21 So we're going to be dewatering a lot of water to put in
22 the deep tank, well into the lower aquifer.

23 So kind of based on the contamination, the level of
24 contamination, that's what we've decided to do. It's
25 kind of a long-term treatment program, a totally

49

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 different animal. This is just the interim action where
Page 42

2 we just do a little bit of excavation, install the
3 system, and we're done. If we have to do more
4 groundwater remediation, we can kind of plan based on
5 the monitoring that we'll be doing following the
6 installation of the Recycled Water Treatment Plant.

7 MR. COOPER: So like if we feel like this is
8 incomplete in any way, the 1065 CAP, which is chugging
9 along shortly thereafter, we'll pick up any additional
10 groundwater remediation that needs to be done in the
11 interim action area. Of course, logistically, it's
12 going to be tough in some zones because the tank is in
13 there. But you can still work around it.

14 MR. BERMAN: You could have -- at the time
15 before the tank goes in, when you're putting in the
16 piping, you anticipate -- it's an extra pipe that would
17 be used with the ORC.

18 MR. COOPER: To inject ORC underneath the
19 tank?

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: The nature of the ORC doesn't
21 lend itself to that sort of use very well. (INAUDIBLE)
22 So it would harden up and clog up the formation around
23 it. There are other technologies you can use such as
24 (INAUDIBLE) solution which is a liquid. In any of those
25 situations, it would probably be easier to come in after

50

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the construction of the tank and put a well in, and then
2 after construction, you follow conventional standards of
3 a well. It's not a significant cost. \$1,000. Not a
4 huge amount.

5 MR. BERMAN: So a small subsidiary well in the
Page 43

6 neighborhood of the tanks?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah. And then you can also
8 look at the data and how it's settled down after the
9 tank facility is in place there. That would be the
10 idea. You just would need to put a tank there.

11 MR. SEELBACK: Thanks, Brian. And again,
12 that's a higher level of cleanup than we're looking to
13 do in this project.

14 MR. BERMAN: What is the tank actually made
15 out of?

16 MR. SEELBACK: The tank is made out of
17 concrete. A big box.

18 MR. BERMAN: It will not have any metal liner
19 of any kind?

20 MR. SEELBACK: Not that I know of. Again,
21 this is a project that Mark Early (PHONETIC) in the
22 Engineering Department is working on. I don't think
23 there is a proposed metal lining.

24 MS. BLUM: I know that the Water Treatment
25 Plant, the wastewater plant, is part of the PTIP. And I

51

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 believe -- I'm looking for substantiation of my
2 recollection here. Didn't George say that a lot of that
3 work would be paid for outside of remediation because it
4 is part of the water/sewage system waste water and not
5 the RAB?

6 MR. SEELBACK: Yeah. We are sharing costs on
7 that. We're actually doing the front-end remediation,
8 cleaning it up, doing the excavation and the soil
9 dewatering, or the groundwater dewatering. And then the

10 next phase of the project will be the construction of
11 the whole system where they're going to be driving sheet
12 piles and creating this big hole for the tank. That's
13 going to be paid for by the other department.

14 MS. BLUM: Engineering or whatever. Is it
15 part of Lucas money maybe, or their early rent?

16 MS. SHIPMAN: I think we're responsible for
17 providing the system for Lucas.

18 MS. BLUM: "We" meaning the RAB?

19 MR. SEELBACK: No, the PTIP.

20 MS. BLUM: Oh, the PTIP.

21 MR. SEELBACK: Yes. It's part of the General
22 Management Plan.

23 MS. BLUM: Right. Just checking.

24 MR. COOPER: Remediation is only paying for
25 remediation work.

52

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MS. BLUM: Okay.

2 MR. COOPER: And we're not paying for
3 installation, the Water Recycling Plan.

4 MS. BLUM: And again, we're not doing work
5 twice. This is part of 6B, right, this location?

6 MR. SEELBACK: It's overlapping.

7 MR. COOPER: Good point. It's in the 1065
8 Study Area, the Petroleum Cap Study Area, but 6B is in
9 there also.

10 MS. BLUM: Right. Are we utilizing the
11 economies of scale in this effort? Basically, you're
12 going to have to clean the area up greater than 6 feet.

13 MR. COOPER: We will not have to clean up --
Page 45

14 that area where we're doing remediation at this Interim
15 Action Plan, we feel that that's going to be a
16 clean-closure cleanup there, except for maybe some
17 residual groundwater stuff that we can pick up later
18 through -- like Brian said -- we can access that by
19 upgradient wells, something like that. But the soil is
20 going to be cleaned up because it's going to be a big --
21 how deep is the tank going to go in?

22 MR. SEELBACK: Between 25 and 30. I'm not
23 sure. I don't remember the final step.

24 MS. TRIGIANI: Where are you putting that
25 dirt?

53

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: That's contaminated soil, so it's
2 going to go offsite. That won't be stored in front of
3 your house.

4 MS. BLUM: Did you say this tank is only going
5 to be 10,000 gallons? It's got to be bigger than that.

6 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it's 100,000.

7 MS. BLUM: That sounds much better to me.

8 MS. SHIPMAN: But Jan, you were referring to
9 the other sections of 6B, right?

10 MS. BLUM: Right. 1065 is right in the middle
11 of 6B, so that was the reason that I asked that
12 question. Are we going to be doing cleanup twice in
13 that area? And I've been assured that there will be a
14 major halo effect, and that we won't be doing two
15 cleanups.

16 MR. COOPER: Not in that particular area.
17 But there could be other portions of 6B --

18 MS. SHIPMAN: 6B isn't going to be taken care
19 of.

20 MR. COOPER: 6B is huge, you know, so --

21 MS. SHIPMAN: Right.

22 MS. BLUM: Right. 1065 is part of the 6B
23 area.

24 MR. COOPER: Right. And the interim action is
25 only a small part of inside 1065. So it's a doughnut

54

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 inside -- yeah. The interim action is here. 1065 is
2 here. 6B is like this.

3 MS. SHIPMAN: I think I see where Jan was
4 going with this. If we're going to clean up that little
5 doughnut hole now, and then later clean up the whole
6 area, would it have been more affordable to have done
7 the whole thing at one time? I mean, if we didn't have
8 this rush job -- are there any significant costs to
9 doing this now as opposed to doing the whole 6B at one
10 time during the interim?

11 MR. COOPER: I guess the answer to that is to
12 do an Interim Action Plan in advance of the Corrective
13 Action Plan, you really need to have a compelling reason
14 to do your interim action. And our compelling reason is
15 we have this schedule to put in the Water Recycling
16 Plant and we need to make that area safe for the
17 construction workers that are going to be installing
18 that Water Recycling Plant and the tank. We need to
19 move that contamination and get it away from any of the
20 construction workers.

21 The rest of the 1065 area would get cleaned up

22 pursuant to the CAP. It would follow the more normal
23 regulatory process. In a perfect world, I would love to
24 have the CAP in place in time for the summer. And we're
25 pushing as hard as we can on the CAP, in fact. I'm just

55

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 nervous that we're not going to get the CAP in place and
2 have all the approvals by this summer when we need to
3 build this Water Recycling Plant. That's why we put the
4 Interim Action Plan out on the streets now so we can do
5 a cleanup in advance if necessary.

6 MS. CHEEVER: I was wondering about
7 dewatering. How does it work, and also is it just
8 temporary while they are putting in the tank, or is it
9 something that lasts indefinitely until the final
10 Corrective Action Plan is developed?

11 MR. SEELBACK: So dewatering is just as you
12 remove soil and you get into the groundwater area, you
13 get ponding of the water. So if we have ponding inside
14 and excavation out at the site -- and we're seeing
15 groundwater between five and seven feet out there --
16 we're going to have to dewater the hole to keep the hole
17 dry.

18 MS. CHEEVER: What does that mean? Pump it
19 out, or --

20 MR. SEELBACK: You can either just stick a
21 pump right in the middle of the hole and just pump the
22 water out, or when you do a deeper excavation, like with
23 the tank, you actually have to put in wells around the
24 area that you're going to be digging and actually
25 extract the water before you do the digging.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MS. CHEEVER: So once the tank is in, would
2 the groundwater return?

3 MR. COOPER: Hopefully the tank won't float.
4 It's concrete.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Was Building 1065 ever an
6 above-ground building or was it just underground?

7 MR. SEELBACK: 1065 was a former building.
8 You can actually see the footprint of the building.

9 MR. COOPER: What caused the contamination at
10 that area of the building?

11 MR. SEELBACK: There were several underground
12 storage tanks with diesel.

13 MS. CHEEVER: But it wasn't what happened at
14 one building itself?

15 MR. SEELBACK: It was the primary
16 contamination. But there are several other things that
17 you could attach to the contamination. There are
18 smaller sumps in the area that collect sediment and
19 contamination from the various building programs.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: That building was removed by
21 the Park Service in about 1996, just the above-ground
22 portion. The foundation is still there and was removed
23 at about the same time that the CEH was removed in
24 advance of the steel work.

25 MS. CHEEVER: What was it used for?

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: Before it was taken out, it

2 was used for a variety of things. It was
3 petroleum-related issues. There was actually a small
4 incinerator in the building for a while. I believe it
5 was used for automotive repair. It was not a
6 particularly substantial building. It was kind of a
7 garage-like shed structure.

8 MS. BLUM: Do you also have sea water at that
9 location or is it just freshwater or whatever?

10 MR. SEELBACK: I believe we do not have tidal
11 water or a tidal effect. Actually I know we don't in
12 that area.

13 MR. COOPER: Any other questions on our
14 Interim Action Plan for 1065?

15 MR. SEELBACK: The next is the skeet range.
16 Maybe you all thought the Skeet Range Project was over,
17 but it's not. I'm going to summarize what we've done so
18 far and what we're going to be doing.

19 Back in June of 2002 we finished the remediation
20 project, which included the excavation and disposal of
21 1800 tons of contaminated sand and concrete debris that
22 we hauled off to an off-site facility. We came in and
23 imported 900 tons of sand to backfill the excavation.

24 Some of the excavations were offshore, so they
25 didn't require backfilling, and we compacted the sand in

58

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 place and resilted the beach. Everything looks nice.

2 In February, we submitted a Draft Remedial Action
3 Excavation Report for agency review. And that is still
4 out there right now. It basically presents the results
5 of the excavation work, and it's got a lot of sampling

6 information.

7 So this shows the five excavations. You can see
8 two of them are pretty close to the water's edge. Those
9 we were backfilling as we were excavating. The Coast
10 Guard building is west to the left. To the right is
11 Crissy Field.

12 So there is a riprap area that's in the middle, and
13 on the end that's labeled Central Area, that's kind of
14 been the erosion hot spot that's developed. We start
15 noticing that immediately that the level of sand was
16 lower than it was before. At the time we backfilled the
17 excavation, the sand was quite a bit lower. It just
18 kind of kept dropping (INAUDIBLE).

19 So in December and November we had those big storms
20 that caused an erosion and damage to the beach and the
21 dunes. And the damage -- I think the storms were big
22 enough so there is a fair amount of erosion, and a lot
23 of sand has moved off the beach there, but particularly
24 around that central excavation, we had collapsing of the
25 fences around the dune areas and the dunes were eroded

59

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 back a fair amount. I don't know if anybody saw that.
2 We actually had waves coming up on the Promenade which
3 I've heard has happened before as well. But in this
4 case, it was pretty bad. We identified an area that
5 looked like it needed some attention. And so we took it
6 to the National Park Service Project Review to discuss
7 and the propose some sort of restoration or rebuilding
8 of that beach somehow.

9 So in December, we didn't come to a final

10 restoration design, but we did run out and place some
11 temporary sandbags on the Promenade. Our primary
12 concern was losing any the Promenade Buildings. We
13 armored that with sandbags.

14 And then in March, we actually brought an excavator
15 out and resculpted the dunes -- well, we added sand to
16 the dunes, and then we put the fences back up. I don't
17 know if any of you saw the fences, but they were kind of
18 mangled looking. So we fixed that.

19 More recently in April, we, with the Park Service
20 and the GGNPA, came to an agreement on a design that
21 would work. It's basically taking sand and adding
22 concrete rubble of different sizes and placing it back
23 into the area called the Central Excavation on that
24 slide back there to create what was there before.

25 MR. COOPER: So the concept is this is the

60

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 zone that's been eroded?

2 MR. SEELBACK: Yeah. Exactly.

3 MR. COOPER: So we took out rubble and riprap
4 to do the cleanup, and now we want to put back an equal
5 volume of this riprap in this zone to make this area of
6 the beach stronger so it doesn't need it in the future.

7 MR. SUTTER: Clean debris, of course.

8 MR. SEELBACK: Yes. We actually sampled the
9 debris, and it came up clean.

10 MR. COOPER: Clean rubble.

11 MR. BERMAN: It is your feeling that the
12 excavation done as part of the cleanup was the cause --
13 allowed the erosion to occur? Because that storm was

14 pretty significant. And there are many areas up and
15 down the coast that suffered serious erosion where there
16 had not been any excavation.

17 MR. SEELBACK: It was hard to evaluate at the
18 time. We recognized it that it wasn't just the common
19 annual storm. It was maybe a ten-year storm or bigger.
20 It happened to come along with some really high tides
21 and there was some big waves. I was watching rather
22 large waves break on that beach during the high tide.
23 So I figured this was probably an unusual event.

24 But also we did kind of track the shape of the
25 beach and did notice that it allowed, not having the

61

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 concrete which was there that we removed, not having
2 that in place, it allowed the water to run up kind of
3 alongside of the riprap area, right up into a walkway or
4 kind of an access path on the Promenade. It was just a
5 coincidence. That one spot is where the Promenade is
6 closest to the Bay. So it's just an unlucky
7 coincidence. And we're going to go back and make sure
8 we don't see it happen again. I guess we're not going
9 to guarantee anything, but we're going to try to put it
10 back the way we found it.

11 MR. BERMAN: If the waves were large enough to
12 have reached the original riprap that was there, it
13 might have eroded the pathway behind the riprap just as
14 well.

15 MR. SEELBACK: It could have. It appeared
16 when we were watching it, that it had a nice, smooth,
17 sandy runway to wash up on, where it didn't have any of

18 the rubble to break down that energy and slow that
19 runoff. Whereas at the other areas where you could see
20 exposed rubble next to the excavation, those areas had
21 more protection: not really right where the riprap was
22 but farther up on the beach, you could see that they
23 weren't getting the same runoff. Yeah, it's debatable,
24 but we're going to replace it.

25 MR. COOPER: Any other questions?

62

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. SEELBACK: Tentative dates you may notice
2 are next week. It's tentative, but we're in place to do
3 all the work and hopefully complete it in the length of
4 one week. There should be low tide early in the morning
5 that we're going to utilize. That should hopefully
6 complete the project, put the fencing back up and try to
7 get the dunes looking the way they were.

8 We're going to replant the dunes. There is an area
9 behind the riprap that we're going to try to restore as
10 well.

11 MR. SUTTER: Craig, is this work an allowable
12 cost on our insurance?

13 MR. COOPER: I certainly hope so. It hasn't
14 been expensed. I'm on to the limit to the Skeet Range
15 account charge number. It would be up to Zurich to
16 decide. We certainly feel that the cost of this work is
17 basically repair work at our remediation site, and if
18 this erosion -- that linkage to our construction work is
19 a real critical point. And I think the fact that the
20 erosion occurred six months -- basically, we did the
21 work in June, and then November the erosion happened

22 right at the place where we did remediation work. If
23 that ten-year storm had happened ten years later, I
24 don't think we would maybe have been arguing that that's
25 not our problem any more. But I think the timing and

63

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 the location were so close on the tail end of our
2 remediation and the location of where the erosion
3 occurred, right at one of our remediation sites, it's
4 pretty clear that we need to take care of this. We
5 think that this time using riprap instead of just coming
6 back with sand will fix the problem once and for all.

7 MR. SUTTER: The reason I asked is this is one
8 of those borderline areas where it could become
9 controversial. What I'm saying is that this might be a
10 precedent-setting circumstance perhaps, and I'd like to
11 request that at some future date you report back as to
12 whether there was any difficulty.

13 MR. COOPER: Whether it was allowed or
14 disallowed?

15 MR. SUTTER: Right.

16 MR. COOPER: Okay. Sure.

17 MR. SEELBACK: There was also an area that is
18 immediately behind the riprap where when the erosion was
19 occurring, we could see the Army's old fill becoming
20 exposed, and that's what we actively remediated.
21 Suddenly we were faced with -- that is not -- as part of
22 our work plan, that area is not supposed to become
23 exposed during normal conditions. So we would have had
24 to do some sort of tidying up regardless, just due to
25 nature. We can also clarify our work.

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 MR. COOPER: Good point.

2 MR. BERMAN: Just as an impression, I think
3 this is not a negative. I think this is actually a
4 lucky coincidence. The fact of the matter is, if it had
5 occurred later on and it wasn't going to be part of it,
6 and you hadn't put in all the riprap and assured that
7 the Army's residuals were not going to be exposed, then
8 it might have occurred later on. And then you couldn't
9 really tie it. And it seems to me that this is an
10 example of a remediation that was larger than expected.
11 And you couldn't really predict it, but the weather came
12 on at the right moment and showed you that you had to
13 step up here for your remediation in order to be
14 resistant to a variance that could occur there in the
15 Bay.

16 So I think it's actually a very lucky break. I
17 don't see how it could be any question that it would not
18 be covered because you got the lucky break. The weather
19 came at the right time. Just another way of looking at
20 that issue.

21 MR. COOPER: It would have been an interesting
22 question if we had gotten our certification close-out
23 report from the regulators and everything looked great,
24 and then it's three or four years later and then the
25 storm hits and we get this erosion. That would have

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 been a very interesting question. I think we at the
2 Trust would have said, "Not our problem anymore." Then

3 the Park Service would have had to pay for bringing in
4 the riprap at that point in time. But that's not
5 happening, so I guess it's a scenario that we really
6 don't need to discuss.

7 MS. TRIGIANI: But you know what? I don't
8 want us to be here all night, but I don't understand
9 that. We fixed the problem, or are we saying we didn't
10 fix the problem? If we didn't fix the problem, doesn't
11 a contractor or an expert that advises us to do it a
12 certain way without -- whatever you call that stuff is?
13 At what point do we stop remediating and it starts
14 becoming a management or maintenance issue for the Trust
15 or the Parks? At what point does that happen? Because
16 I'm worried that people are going, "Oh, we've got that
17 money there. Let's kind of keep tapping it until it's
18 gone."

19 MR. COOPER: Me, too. Right.

20 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think the key here is that
21 the action that is going to happen now is the
22 replacement of the concrete that was removed incidental
23 to the cleanup.

24 MS. TRIGIANI: Incidental. What do you mean?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: That the cleanup was going

66

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 after the contamination that was in the concrete and
2 sand, not the concrete and sand itself. In order to get
3 the contamination, the sand and concrete was removed as
4 well as the contaminated flecks.

5 MS. TRIGIANI: Okay. So why didn't somebody
6 think to put it back?

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's one of the those things.
8 It's not as much of a science. There's a little bit of
9 exactly knowing how it's going to react until a storm
10 comes through.

11 MR. BERMAN: That's why it's a lucky break, in
12 a sense.

13 MS. TRIGIANI: Sam, I don't think it's lucky,
14 because it's more money gone. I respectfully disagree.
15 I'm glad it will be paid for, but at some point, I'm
16 not -- and I'm probably misunderstanding something
17 here -- but I'm not getting why this isn't a standard
18 maintenance issue as opposed to something that --

19 MR. COOPER: Again, I think it's the timing of
20 when the problem occurred.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: It was essentially the first
22 storm after the work.

23 MR. COOPER: The regulatory agencies haven't
24 signed off on completion yet.

25 MS. TRIGIANI: So maybe it wasn't really done.

67

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 It was still open.

2 MR. COOPER: Yeah. It was not a
3 construction-completion approved site yet. So you're
4 still vulnerable. That's why, for example, Landfill 4
5 and Fill Site 5, you have to push on these Construction
6 Completion Reports and Certification Reports, because
7 that's when we finally get to close the chapter on
8 spending remediation money.

9 MS. TRIGIANI: It becomes someone else's
10 money.

11 MR. COOPER: Right. It becomes a maintenance
12 issue. If something happens there that could be erosion
13 or whatever, then the Trust Operations Department might
14 have to pay for it or Park Service might have to pay for
15 it because it's in Area A, etc.

16 MR. KERN: What are we looking at for this
17 operation to cost, approximately?

18 MR. COOPER: The repair work?

19 MR. SEELBACK: Our subcontractor cost at this
20 time is \$30,000. It's a pretty small percentage of the
21 total cost of the Range.

22 MR. BERMAN: Anyway Mary, I didn't mean to say
23 that it was lucky in the sense that it was going to cost
24 more. I meant that it was lucky that the job was going
25 to be done right, and I'm more concerned with that.

68

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Yes, if it was millions and millions more, then we'd all
2 be concerned.

3 MS. TRIGIANI: I'm on the same page now, Sam.
4 Thank you.

5 MS. CHEEVER: There are two more pictures.

6 MR. SEELBACK: This is during the second storm
7 in December.

8 MS. TRIGIANI: People don't go down there, do
9 they?

10 MR. SEELBACK: Normally, it is a path that was
11 being used by much of the public to get around this
12 feature, which is just concrete. And so the erosion,
13 our excavation started back here and it ran down across
14 to about here and then it went out to low tide.

15 Now this is high tide during the peak of the storm.
16 So the water didn't get any higher than this. You could
17 see where the waves were coming around here, as well as
18 overtopping this bank. This bank is the Army fill that
19 I'm talking about. We saw that it was exposed, and we
20 didn't plan for that. So that would have needed to be
21 dealt with regardless.

22 And then you can see here some kind of residual
23 material. We call it like a rubble sill. It lines the
24 underside of this whole beach. During the summer you
25 don't see it, but in the winter you do. Well, we

69

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 removed that when we made our excavation.

2 Here you can clearly see the waves are coming up
3 and washing up into the Promenade. I have a lot of
4 photographs. I didn't get them all in there. This
5 photograph is the March Trust, three hours of
6 restoration.

7 MR. COOPER: March of this year.

8 MR. SEELBACK: March of this year, correct.
9 Where we went out and stood up all the posts and pushed
10 some of the sand back up on to the back beach and
11 nourished the path and kind of made it look normal
12 again. Any other questions?

13 MR. KERN: Thank you. Item No. 6. Bob or Jim?
14 Thank you.

15 Any new business? All right.

16 We have a long list of recently released documents.

17 MR. COOPER: Because I haven't been doing a
18 good job on that recently, I pulled project managers'

19 comprehensive lists over the last couple of months.

20 MR. BERMAN: Some of these have been out for a
21 while.

22 MR. COOPER: Exactly. So some are not so
23 recent. But there you have it.

24 MR. KERN: That continues on the back of the
25 next page.

70

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Let's move to Review of Action Items portion of the
2 evening. I have only one action item which is the
3 back-up financial pages.

4 MR. COOPER: Committee meeting.

5 MR. KERN: Any other action items?

6 MR. BERMAN: I think Craig said he would look
7 in to make sure that the comments made at one of the
8 previous meetings on the preliminary EKI report were
9 indeed E-mailed on a certain day.

10 MR. COOPER: Right.

11 MR. BOGGS: I have an item of clarity for the
12 RAB. We recently had some discussion at my agency.
13 There is kind of another cleanup going on at the
14 Presidio, but it's kind of separate from us. It has to
15 do with the Golden Gate Bridge and the Bridge District.
16 So the project manager for that and I are getting
17 together later this month to try to make sure we're
18 coordinated better.

19 And then my question is to you guys, do you want to
20 be involved in some way with the cleanup that's involved
21 with the Bridge District, or would you like me to
22 provide some updates on occasion on what's happening

23 there or any other things you guys might suggest to be
24 participating in?

25 MR. KERN: I can tell you from an historical

71

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 perspective that the RAB did participate years ago when
2 the Bridge District first envisioned having their sites
3 retrofitted. It was kind of the interaction that we
4 heard today, that there would be areas where workers
5 would be exposed to lead contamination, but we never
6 found out about the larger area of lead and what was
7 going to be done with that. And there was a lot of
8 issues between plants and historic structures and a
9 whole bunch of things.

10 So I would recommend that we do participate. It's
11 on the Presidio property. It's adjacent to areas that
12 we have an interest in. So I would think we would
13 potentially want to provide comments. Maybe we could
14 have a presentation. Is the same guy still over at the
15 Bridge District?

16 MR. BOGGS: I'm not sure, but there are some
17 issues regarding their lead cleanup with serpentinite
18 collapsed right underneath the (INAUDIBLE) of the bridge
19 there. They've found some interesting things.

20 MR. BERMAN: Did they find a Chrom 6?

21 MR. BOGGS: I don't know. Lead is their
22 primary concern.

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: They do not look for Chrom 6.
24 I reviewed the reports that have been issued to date. On
25 the Presidio side, the two metals that they focus on are

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 lead and zinc. Those are the two principal elements of
2 the coatings that were used on the south side of the
3 bridge. On the north side of the bridge, they do not
4 use zinc coating. And so it's only lead that they've
5 looked at. And it's been discussed. It's one of
6 Chris's -- were there other compounds in the lead? But
7 to date, to my knowledge, they were only testing for the
8 lead and zinc.

9 MR. BERMAN: Because of the way that chromium
10 is used as a rust preventative, you would think it would
11 be a natural, at that time at the south end, that they
12 might have used some anti-corrosive materials like that.

13 MR. ULLENSVANG: They apparently have a fairly
14 good history of what they were using. It was lead and
15 linseed oil, a very heavy, metal-based coating. They
16 report that they know very much what the major materials
17 were in their anti-corrosion systems. And it appears
18 that the bulk of the contamination occurred from single
19 episodes of sandblasting. And so they have a good idea
20 of what they were blasting off, and when they did that.

21 MR. BERMAN: Is it much of an additional cost
22 to test for a few of those other things, the other heavy
23 metals?

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: They argue that it wasn't
25 worth it. And we're not in a position to make or not

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 make a (INAUDIBLE).

2 MR. BERMAN: What's your feeling about that,

3 Bob?

4 MR. BOGGS: I truthfully know very little
5 about the project. I know the project person at DTSC
6 that is leading that project. She's a long-term person,
7 very knowledgeable and very well-respected. I would tend
8 to think that probably, as Brian pointed out, they
9 should probably provide us with sufficient
10 documentation.

11 Zinc is probably the most widely used
12 anti-corrosive material. I wouldn't be surprised if
13 they provided sufficient information to say that they're
14 justified in not spending another \$10,000 to have other
15 metals analyzed for if they weren't of concern. That's
16 all I can say at this point because I haven't reviewed
17 the reports. I do know the lead person and she is a
18 very knowledgeable person.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: The lead levels are fairly
20 high in certain places. So it's (INAUDIBLE) cleanup and
21 distribution of contamination.

22 MR. KERN: It would be great to be involved
23 somehow.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: The Bridge District is in the
25 process of completing a predictive Ecological Risk

74

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Assessment. They had sampled what they call a Phase Two
2 Area, which is beyond their initial cleanup on both
3 approaches to the bridge. They did that some time ago.
4 I guess it was almost a year ago. They did ecological
5 risk assessments sampling which is something that was
6 not done by the Army or the Trust on the Presidio, where

7 they actually go and collect specimens of plants and
8 animals. And you test plots of lettuce and other plants
9 looking for how much of actual uptake of contaminants
10 there are as opposed to the way it was done at the
11 Presidio Trust with just a predicted paper study. This
12 is often done to refine the risk numbers.

13 Those data are being compiled now into a report.
14 It's my understanding that that report will be submitted
15 to the Agency and hopefully to the Park Service shortly.
16 I know that the State Ecological Risk Assessor has seen
17 some of the information that's come out of the report,
18 although the report isn't out. So that would be the
19 next phase. It will talk about what sort of ecological
20 risk numbers might be incorporated for the areas around
21 the bridge, which would then drive cleanup numbers.

22 MS. TRIGIANI: On both sides of the bridge?

23 MR. ULLENSVANG: On both sides of the bridge.

24 MS. TRIGIANI: Over what period of time?

25 MR. ULLENSVANG: They collected the samples I

75

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 think about a year ago, and then took at least a year to
2 develop a study. So they've been working on this for at
3 least two years.

4 And it was complicated because on the north side of
5 the bridge, the lead contamination extends into a native
6 species habitat. And so we've expressed considerable
7 concerns about lead uptake in through the food chain
8 into the butterflies which are over there that are
9 endangered. It's particularly difficult because you
10 can't sample endangered species.

11 I have not seen the data. I have heard that they
12 do have some uptake into their food chain, but I don't
13 know to what extent or what situation that is.

14 MR. KERN: So when the report comes out, maybe
15 we can get a copy or get a presentation or something?

16 MR. BERMAN: It would be nice to have a
17 presentation at a regular RAB meeting on this. It
18 certainly is an interesting issue with a slightly
19 different approach. It overlaps our interest and
20 probably has some nasty comments about the Park Service.

21 MR. KERN: Which would make for an interesting
22 evening. So anything else on this? Jan, did you have
23 something for us this evening?

24 MS. BLUM: This is on the positive side.
25 There's going to be a planting event in the former Fill

76

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Site 5 which the volunteer/environmental community has
2 renamed Sunset Scrub, which is much nicer than Fill Site
3 5. I believe it's going to be the 28th. Craig showed
4 us that fabulous picture of that huge area. So this is
5 our opportunity possibly to put a spade in the ground
6 and put a little plant in that and finish up the
7 remediation and restoration process.

8 I'll let Doug know when it is. And even if 20
9 people come out, it might be fun to put that plant in
10 the ground. This is what it's all about for me, the
11 remediation, is making it clean and lovely again. It's
12 the 28th of May, I believe. It's a Wednesday night, and
13 it's sort of an unscheduled activity. I'll put some
14 detail out.

15 MS. WRIGHT: Do you know if it's 6:00 o'clock?

16 MS. BLUM: I think it's between 5:15 and 7:00,
17 but I need to get particulars. I don't know if they're
18 going to put 12 plants in the ground or they're going to
19 be starting with thousands because the plan is thousands
20 eventually.

21 Anything else from anyone this evening? Thanks to
22 everyone for coming tonight, your participation.

23 Without objection, the meeting is adjourned.

24 (Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)

25 RAB MEMBERS

77

CLARK REPORTING (510) 486-0700

1 Sam Berman
2 Jan Blum
3 Bob Boggs, DTSC
4 Edward Callahan
5 Julie Cheever
6 Craig Cooper
7 George Dies
8 Tony DiStefano
9 Gloria Gee
10 Doug Kern
11 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
12 David Sutter
13 Mary Trigianni
14 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
15 Tracy Wright
16 Gloria Yaros
17
18 Others Present:

19 Ryan Seelback, Presidio Trust

20 Dorinda Shipman

21 ---o0o---

22

23

24

25

RAB June 20 2003.txt

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICERS CLUB
BUILDING 50
THE PRESIDIO

June 10, 2003
7:00 p.m.

Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings

CLARK REPORTING
2161 Shattuck Avenue, Suite 201
Berkeley, CA 94704
(510) 486-0700

Freddie Reppond, Reporter

2

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:04 P.M.]

MR. KERN: Good evening, everyone. This is the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory board, June 2003. Welcome to the Presidio Trust and their contractors, National Park Service; our regulators. Community members.

Does everyone have an agenda? Any changes or additions? We'll move on from there. Any announcements?

MR. COOPER: Yes. I have an announcement. As you know, Anna Hathaway has been our community involvement coordinator for the Trust since Jane Packer was laid off last year. And I am very sad to announce that tonight is going to be Anna's last meeting with us; and she's leaving the Presidio Trust for greener pastures. And she's going to get and get her PhD in English Lit at Northwestern University. And on that note, if you just thought cookies were the snack for tonight, I even have more. I have a cake for Anna. And it says, "Good Luck, Anna. We're going to miss you." I'm going to cut this up and I've got little plates here, and we'll have a little cake in her honor.

It's been an honor to work with you. Thank you very much for filling in for Jane. It was wonderful. It made the transition very easy for us.

3

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

And we wish you great luck in Chicago. Send us an e-mail every now and then.

MS. HATHAWAY: It's been a pleasure to work with all of you. I respect your dedication. I wish you the best of luck with this incredible project.

MR. COOPER: Could you come up here for

7 photographic reasons?

8 MS. HATHAWAY: Sure.

9 MR. BOGGS: While the cake is being cut, I
10 have an announcement. I would like to welcome Rachel
11 Marie. She's our new public participation specialist.
12 She comes from the private sector side, but she's been
13 involved in a lot of private cleanups with companies and
14 probably more contentious sites that we have here. So
15 if you have any questions or concerns regarding public
16 involvement, distribution of fact sheets, public
17 participation, and that kind of stuff, Rachel is the
18 person to talk to and work with. So as Anna is stepping
19 out, we've got a new person stepping in. So welcome.

20 MR. COOPER: I have another one. For all the
21 RAB members who are wondering who is going to be taking
22 Anna's place, it's going to be Denise Braga, who I think
23 many of the older RAB members know. She has been
24 working kind of 50/50 with Anna right now already on the
25 community duties, so she'll take over the rest of stuff

4

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 that Anna has been doing. You'll see her at least at
2 the beginning of every RAB meeting and with us on a lot
3 of coordination and things like that. And the rest of
4 us at the staff will be around. I've been told I would
5 not be able to bring in additional help. So that is
6 that announcement. Most everybody already knows Denise.

7 MR. KERN: Other announcements? Mark.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: We have the date for the
9 planting at Fill Site 5. Does anybody know what that
10 is?

11 MS. TRIGIANI: The 18th, in the morning.
12 Wednesday, 9:00 to 12:00 in the morning. June 18th.

13 MR. KERN: Is there any chance of getting an
14 evening session, if that might work? I don't know how
15 many folks will be able to make it at 9:00 to 12:00 on a
16 weekday. But, Mark, we could certainly have a brief
17 event on an evening.

18 MR. FREY: The issue is there were 10,000
19 plants going in this year. Thirty percent of those have
20 died because of delays, so we have less volunteer work
21 to be done generally on the site and we have already
22 scheduled two work groups as one.

23 MR. KERN: Anything else? Planning committee
24 meeting report. Mark?

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: We had our regularly scheduled

5

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 planning committee on May 27. We met at Building 1750.
2 The topics we discussed were Fill Site 5 planting, which
3 we just covered. We talked a little bit about off-site
4 disposal of lead-contaminated soil. That was a
5 follow-up issue from the Tennessee Hollow working group
6 letter on wet tests and the lead contamination that was
7 found at Fill Site 4. The Trust gave us some
8 information on that topic. We talked about the cost
9 update. We had an updated spreadsheet. We had a pretty
10 long discussion about the spreadsheet and how to deal
11 with that, and various aspects of cost updating and
12 other aspects of financial reporting. And we decided to
13 have a finance committee for some sort of central

RAB June 20 2003.txt

14 working group. We need to make written recommendations
15 about the spreadsheet for cost reporting that's sort of
16 going on by e-mail right now. Then we talked about the
17 working groups for the feasibility study for the
18 Tennessee Hollow, Fort Scott, and the Coastal Bluffs.
19 We scheduled a follow-up meeting the following Tuesday
20 to talk about Battery Howe-Wagner, Sam's group, and we
21 had a good meeting at Building 1750 to talk about that
22 battery, and we're working on a letter on that. That
23 was it. Next meeting is the fourth Tuesday of this
24 month. Thank you.

25 MR. KERN: Any questions for Mark? All right.

6

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Moving on to Reports, Item 5-A.
2 This particular item kind of fell to me. And
3 I'm here to report a little bit this evening that we may
4 have been a little bit ambitious to try to get all these
5 letters done by this evening; so I'm not quite ready to
6 prepare them. We've had a number of things going back
7 and forth on the Tennessee Hollow letter. I haven't got
8 my first draft to you yet, Sam, as promised. The
9 Coastal Bluffs group -- we are still trying to get that
10 letter together? And Lobos Creek does have a letter in
11 draft. And I don't know. Did you want to talk about it
12 at all tonight?

13 MS. CHEEVER: I have copies of it, but it's
14 still in draft. I brought copies of it. What would you
15 suggest?

16 MR. KERN: I think it might be good to hand it
17 out. If people haven't seen it, they could take it home
18 and we could can still take more comments.

19 MS. CHEEVER: I'm happy to hand it out, with
20 the note that it's a draft. So far it's been circulated
21 among the Lobos Creek working group, so this is the
22 first time that other community members of the RAB have
23 seen it.

24 This particular letter is only two pages.
25 And, as it says, perhaps what we're saying is not even

7

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 so much comments, since comments are not even called for
2 at this point, but rather noting some concerns and
3 considerations we want to keep in mind during future
4 public comments and also discussions as remedies are
5 developed. So these concern five different sites in the
6 Lobos Creek area, not including Landfills 8 and 10,
7 which are very important but are not considered at this
8 point.

9 So Mountain Lake, as we have said many times
10 here, I think we are -- most people certainly support
11 the remedy for Mountain Lake. But since we are writing,
12 or at least drafting a letter, we thought it was
13 worthwhile to reiterate what we've said many times, that
14 we think the Trust should understand this point of view
15 that it should be a top priority, because, if you were
16 to measure a site according to the amount of use of it
17 and the public interest in it, I think Mountain Lake is
18 one of the top sites in the Presidio by that criterion.
19 So we're just reiterating that, in spite of working out
20 problems with Caltrans, we think it should be a top

priority.

Lobos Creek is also a site of great public interest. And we, in our working group meeting, we talked about the lead and arsenic found, which still is not quite understood why it's there. So this letter

8

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

just mentions that there's some debris nearby in the stream; and maybe there's a former household waste site.

Third is the Nike facility, which has been part of the RAB since 1996. So, again, we just thought we would mention again that we think it's really a possible safety hazard to leave these missile magazines empty and in place and also a possible danger if there is ever an earthquake. And if these structures were not filled, we would recommend continued sampling of the water collecting at the bottom.

And the next two areas. We commend the fact that the Trust has carried out additional testing. In one case, no testing was done by the Army at the Nike swale; and, in the case of Graded Area 9, very little testing was done. But we have a couple of concerns or thoughts that we are keeping in mind about those. One, since the Nike swale is right below the former Nike missile site, do we feel confident that the routes of all the drainage channels have been found and tested?

And then, last one, Graded Area 9. The additional testing seems adequate if the area is to be covered with additional sand or soil, but if some reason the existing soil needed to be removed for whatever reason, then we think additional testing would be needed; and it would be covered by the base-wide

9

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

contingency plan.

So any fellow RAB members have any comments right now? Or else you can e-mail them to me and other committee members.

MR. YOUNGKIN: "Base-wide contingency plan"; is that a real thing?

MR. COOPER: Well, it didn't make it last year, so what we're doing at the Trust, that was called the contingency removal action work plan. So we are rewriting it to be just a soil management plan or something like that. In fact, it's getting near to the point where we want to release it and let all the stakeholders take a look at it. It's resurfacing. It's not going to resurface as a formal regulatory document to be approved by DTSC, but we think it's an important document for the stakeholders to know about or when we do get these previously unknown little bits of soil contamination here and there that they know what our procedures are that we're going to follow. Should be out by, I would say, in July. I wish I had put that on the updates.

MR. YOUNGKIN: So it is not a base-wide contingency plan?

MR. COOPER: Right now, we have this "draft law," we'll call it. I understand what you're talking

10

RAB June 20 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 about there. You don't even have to change the name.

2 MS. CHEEVER: I'd rather change the name
3 though.

4 MR. NELSON: I'm not necessarily sure that if
5 you were to remove fill for any reason rather than
6 remediation that the plan would cover that activity.

7 MR. COOPER: That plan is more for unknown
8 contamination. I think what you were driving at is --
9 yeah, that plan is for if you have something that has
10 never been tested before, here are the protocols that we
11 would follow for testing that and figuring out what it
12 is and digging it up and taking it away. I think what
13 you're driving at is, if we did decide to take a
14 no-further-action for an area and later on we wanted to
15 move that soil around, that before sending it off site
16 or something like that that it would probably be
17 characterized. Is that the crux of the comment?

18 MS. CHEEVER: What happens if you remove it
19 and do some testing after you remove it? If you move
20 the existing soil -- not for remediation but for
21 convenience -- if additional contamination that you
22 didn't expect were discovered, is that called "unknown
23 contamination"?

24 MR. COOPER: Then it would be governed -- I
25 would think it would be governed by this plan. This

11

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 plan -- we have to talk to the regulatory agency some
2 more about it -- it's meant for small-scale stuff. It
3 depends on what we hit and how much of it we hit. If we
4 hit a whole bunch of bad stuff, depending on whether
5 it's petroleum or whatever, basically what we're hoping
6 is if it's just a little bit we can clean it up under
7 this soil management plan. If it's bigger, then the
8 regulatory agency would probably want us to get some
9 kind of decision document in place before we moved it
10 around and made a final disposition of that soil.

11 MR. KERN: Just to clarify, I think Julie
12 mentioned that Landfills 8 and 10 aren't included in
13 this letter because it's not part of the feasibility
14 study, but when there is a document for those sites --
15 and is that due out at some point real soon? This group
16 is also putting together some comments on those sites.

17 MR. BOGGS: Probably next month.

18 MR. KERN: Okay. Well, if you have a chance
19 to read over the Lobos Creek working group document,
20 please do and get Julie comments. Then it looks like,
21 since I've been a little slow off the mark, we'll need
22 some extra time. Perhaps we'll review all of these and
23 type them up and review them at the next meeting and
24 decide whether to send them in as a package. Or if
25 people need even more time we can come back at the next

12

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 meeting. But, likely, at the next committee meeting
2 we'll wrap this up.

3 Thank you, Julie, for your work on this.

4 Also, out there, the Tennessee Hollow letter
5 is coming along. Still some decisions to be made and
6 some comments going back and forth even as late as

Page 5

7 today.

8 Fort Scott, as I mentioned, I'm working with
9 Sam. Coastal Bluffs, Mark and I are getting something
10 together to show George.

11 As a final note, another letter is the finance
12 working group subcommittee that we put together. We
13 have a letter that's been in draft. It's been
14 circulated. I've got a bunch of comments back. There's
15 some variety of opinions that we're trying to whittle
16 down to a better level. So we've got five things out
17 there to finish.

18 Any comments or thoughts about how this is
19 going? Thanks for your patience with me on that
20 particular item.

21 Moving on to staff updates and the petroleum
22 program.

23 MR. NELSON: Craig and I are going to present
24 all the projects that we are working on right now in a
25 brief presentation. I'll be covering all the projects

13

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 that I'm working on currently. Those are mostly CERCLA
2 projects.

3 MR. COOPER: You'll notice that in the last
4 several RAB meetings we've been trying to focus issues,
5 more details on particular projects, like we had the
6 firing range RFS. For this one it is a little bit
7 different. This is more going back to what we normally
8 do, which is give a very brief overview on all the
9 projects. That's what we're doing this time, a very
10 brief overview on all the projects. You'll see just a
11 couple bullets under each project name. Ask questions.
12 Just because there's only one or two bullets under each
13 project, stop us and ask a question when a project of
14 interest comes up. Ask questions.

15 MR. NELSON: All my projects that are
16 currently active are going to fit on two whopping slides
17 tonight.

18 As Doug and Mark mentioned earlier in their
19 discussion of the committee meetings, the Trust's
20 revised feasibility study for installation sites went
21 out in March. It is currently being reviewed by the
22 agencies and the RAB. And the RAB working groups are
23 currently reviewing the various watershed sites and
24 commenting and providing a letter at some point in the
25 near future to the Trust.

14

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 Also, as Doug has requested earlier, what's
2 known as the five-year review for the Public Health
3 Service Hospital RAP sites, which is Landfills 8 and 10
4 is currently being reviewed by the Trust and the Park
5 Service. That document was prepared by URS, who are our
6 consultants. We should have that ready for review by
7 the RAB in July.

8 MR. KERN: Could you give us a sneak preview,
9 or is it hush-hush?

10 MR. NELSON: Depends on how Bob and Jim would
11 feel hearing about it here for the first time in front
12 of everyone.

13 MR. BOGGS: It probably would not be news to

me.

MR. NELSON: There was some contamination at Landfill 8 that was previously uncharacterized, not fairly widespread, but throughout the site and at varying depths in the soil. However, it appears that it's not beneath the site. It's generally metals, PAHs, and pesticides. And the site is fairly similar in shape and size to what EKI had projected in 1998, sort of an expanded glob plus a little wing area. It's not quite the same shape, but it's still larger than we originally thought.

At Landfill 10, what the Army characterized as

15

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

"no contamination" in 1997 after they did some soil confirmation sampling and since our cleanup levels generally went down there are [inaudible] just from looking at that; and there's some disposability issues we're still working.

The groundwater issue. There doesn't seem like there's a big impact from the sites. There are some anomalous readings from some metals but no organics to speak of.

MR. KERN: It's really very much to commend you guys for doing that additional testing and investigation. This site was one of the first ones that I looked at in 1994; and here it is 2003, and the Army maintained it was nothing there. So here we are nine years later, something there. So we really need to hand it to you and thank you for doing that investigation.

MR. COOPER: Generally, parties don't like to reopen things that theoretically were a done deal. But obviously we felt the Army had not fully investigated certain aspects.

MR. O'HARA: Depending on what you do in terms of opening site, who pays?

MR. NELSON: Well, we have money from the MOA with the Army.

MR. O'HARA: But wasn't that site closed at

16

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

the time when the decision was made?

MR. NELSON: The Army MOA recognized --

MR. COOPER: We won't get any more than that.

MR. NELSON: Right. But the Army MOA and the Trust MOA with the Park Service recognized that there would probably be improved remedies applied to those sites, given that if you take a look at these sights and compare them to other landfills and other sites in the Presidio, that these had very soft remedies applied and lot of data gaps existed. It was understood that additional work was likely to be done.

MR. COOPER: So some money was originally budgeted from the get-go.

MR. O'HARA: So you can qualify for those dollars?

MR. COOPER: Yeah.

MR. O'HARA: And your work will be measured against those dollars?

MR. NELSON: Yep.

MR. O'HARA: I think that that information, as

21 we move through this, would be kind of important,
22 because what you have is an estimate of dollars to clean
23 up for a site that was otherwise characterized as pretty
24 clean.

25 MR. NELSON: Right.

17

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. O'HARA: And I'm a little uncomfortable
2 with the fact that the site was signed off as being
3 cleaned yet, wink-wink, we know that there was probably
4 contamination there, so we'll allocate a million
5 dollars.

6 MR. BOGGS: No. We weren't signing off on the
7 cleanup. They were signed off as remedies as contained.
8 There's an asphalt parking-lot on top of 10. On 8,
9 previous investigation didn't show any surface
10 contamination, but we knew below ground there was
11 contamination, so the remedy called for maintaining the
12 cover of that landfill. In fact, when we're talking
13 about these changes per this five-year review, there's
14 discussion as to whether the investigation found a
15 significant enough change to the remedy that we have
16 that it requires a RAP in something like that, as
17 opposed to they're really maintaining the RAP, i.e.,
18 containment in place of those landfills in order to
19 contain that. It's like if a different landfill
20 developed a crack in its cap, you got to go fix it. You
21 have not changed any remedy. So part of Landfill 10 is
22 slipping a little bit. They need to go fix that. But
23 so far what the discussions are they're not changing
24 that remedy of containing that landfill. They're just
25 making it safer than what it is, and they're fixing the

18

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 problem that are starting to develop. Similarly at
2 Landfill 8, they're not showing any groundwater
3 problems; there's not any anticipation that's going to
4 happen in the future. They need to maintain a safe
5 cover over that landfill, so that there were remedies
6 that recognized there was contamination, not that it was
7 clean, through this five-year review process. Figuring
8 out the remedies that are applied they need to be
9 brought up to maintain them.

10 MR. COOPER: All the more reason to do this
11 kind of site-specific cost tracking. It's a good point.
12 All the more reason from the last RAB committee meeting
13 it really made me think about how important that is to
14 do the site-specific cost accounting so we can see what
15 was originally budgeted and what we're expecting to
16 spend on it. Maybe it was originally budgeted at half a
17 million; and it turns out maybe it will cost two million
18 to protect the environment. That's what it's going to
19 take. That's important information to track.

20 MR. O'HARA: The other remedy that's in place,
21 if you are going to have a constant maintenance
22 problem -- I'm not talking about the next 10 or 15
23 years -- but in perpetuity is it in the long run, from a
24 financial standpoint and a safety standpoint, is it
25 really the right remedy?

19

CLARK REPORTING
Page 8

1 MR. COOPER: Good question. I would think
2 that if we would keep it and maintain in place a proper
3 remedy it would be engineered in a more secure fashion,
4 whereas the one before was leave it alone and hopefully
5 it will be okay. And one that we would probably take a
6 look at would be more engineered in a way that it
7 wouldn't be such a long-term problem.

8 MR. BERMAN: How much of the modifications
9 considered in 8 are due to the fact that the cleanup
10 levels are actually lower now than when the Army made
11 their original report? Because in a sense we can't
12 fault the Army completely, because the cleanup levels
13 have dropped since then. And that, of course, would
14 affect your decision of what to do.

15 MR. NELSON: Eight had contamination that was
16 recognized in the RAP, but the FS for Public Service
17 Health Hospital they did a risk assessment and it
18 basically showed there was either incomplete pathway or
19 there was no risk or a manageable risk if you could
20 monitor the site. There are areas of the site that were
21 previously uncharacterized; and had they been
22 characterized, they probably would have exceeded cleanup
23 goals -- the old cleanup goals. But I think, because
24 they had so few samples at that time and they were
25 characterizing a site that was much smaller, they felt

20

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 that the risk management was easier to deal with. But
2 now we know, through taking samples throughout the
3 entire site and from previously uncharacterized areas we
4 did some edge confirmation to try to find out where the
5 actual edges of the site are that we feel more
6 confident. And that also opened up a new subject, which
7 was contamination that was not known about. Does that
8 answer your question?

9 MR. BERMAN: Yeah. But I think, in part, the
10 site not being properly characterized in terms of its
11 extent plus the additional sampling and the lowering of
12 cleanup levels all contributed -- I think they all
13 contribute to your decision here.

14 MR. NELSON: Yeah. I think what they had done
15 when they took the surface samples, which were not very
16 contaminated, and they took samples from beneath the
17 site, but they did not go into the waste mass and take
18 the soil that was contaminated with fill materials; and
19 so it was easy for them come up with a conclusion that
20 there wasn't much contamination there, because they
21 weren't actually taking samples from the hottest part of
22 the site.

23 MR. HERMANN: Did you find any evidence that
24 any of this stuff was leaking down into Landfill 10?

25 MR. NELSON: Not definitively. Like I said,

21

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 there are some anomalous elevated concentrations of some
2 of the metals in the groundwater at Landfill 10 wells.
3 There doesn't appear to be any correlation between what
4 was found in the groundwater at the site and what's in
5 Lobos Creek. For instance, there's an elevated level of
6 copper that was detected pretty far downstream of the

RAB June 20 2003.txt

7 site which goes into Lobos Creek, but copper was not
8 found in the monitoring well, so there's a disconnect
9 there as to where the copper is coming from.

10 MR. COOPER: We can definitely make it a focus
11 issue for a RAB meeting so we can talk about that in
12 detail, once the report is released.

13 MR. NELSON: It's a lot of information,
14 because they really reviewed everything from information
15 collected back from remedial investigation,
16 concentration sampling, and all the work that's been
17 done; so it's a very comprehensive analysis. So that
18 document will be coming out next month.

19 On Landfill E there's also a report coming out
20 that documents the field investigation that was
21 conducted last fall. That will be coming out,
22 hopefully, in the next few weeks. We are reviewing it
23 for our final approval.

24 On the firing ranges we had consultation
25 recently with the agencies on our work plan for those

22

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 five sites. And based on that meeting we're going to be
2 reissuing an addendum to the field sampling plan that
3 basically calls out the changes that we will be able to
4 get in the field in the summer and conduct the sampling
5 work. So stay tuned for more development on that.

6 Julie mentioned Mountain Lake. She mentioned
7 support of RAB working groups and doing additional
8 restoration work and remediation work. And you'll be
9 glad to know that we continue to work on remediation
10 design. I've reported this to you before, but we are in
11 the process of preparing a base map that will help us
12 select volumes for excavation itself and help us with
13 staging areas around the site. It's a very important
14 tool for designers to have a map that has all the
15 elevation features. And they're actually going to apply
16 some orthophotography for that so you can get very
17 current information.

18 Also, there is additional work in place in
19 Mountain Lake to be continuing the restoration work. I
20 don't know if you stay on top of that, but there's some
21 work to be done around some restoration work. There's
22 been some southern shore improvements. They are
23 continuing to do what they can in the way of restoration
24 that is not going to be in conflict with remediation of
25 the site.

23

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 We have started a new project. EKI is doing a
2 feasibility study for us on-site and is the only company
3 that's done any sampling of the Nike swale. As part of
4 the feasibility study, it's currently working on
5 preparing a pre-field sampling plan to help us with the
6 remedial design characterization for that site. So
7 that's sort of a propos of what Julie had said earlier
8 about characterizing the site further and removing
9 contamination. We'll have more on that as the summer
10 progresses.

11 That's all I have on my projects.

12 MR. KERN: On the Nike swale project is it
13 going to expand the area that you're going to look at,

RAB June 20 2003.txt

14 or is it changing the thought process in any way? There
15 were supposedly these drainages coming down the sides;
16 and you're going to sample those areas?

17 MR. NELSON: Right. In the FS sampling, we
18 tried to confirm whether or not those drainage out-falls
19 were the source of transporting contaminants in the
20 site. And in a few areas it didn't look like that was a
21 possibility; and in other areas it looked like those
22 areas were either too far away or the contamination was
23 not being transported; so we have an area that looks
24 pretty good. We do have some confirmations that were
25 clean in some areas. And in some areas we do have some

24

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 additional samples that will help us determine where the
2 boundaries that were found before exist. It's kind of a
3 tricky site because a portion of it is almost entirely
4 exotic species that need to be removed. The southern
5 portion is in great shape with a lot of really hardy
6 native plants. We are fortunate to have not found a lot
7 of contamination in the areas where the riparian habitat
8 is, so we're focusing more on the western side where
9 there was some fill placed at one time and also some of
10 the out-falls look a little more obvious, an actual
11 depression where water was flowing down from the
12 parking-lot; and it's where contamination might have
13 come from.

14 MR. COOPER: Based on your letter, it sounds
15 like you think we missed one of the drainages, so if you
16 have a specific idea on that definitely let's hear it.

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: We were talking about the
18 drainage for the magazines -- you know, where the
19 drainage system had water -- and we weren't clear if
20 that had --

21 MR. NELSON: That is part of what's going to
22 be remediated at the Nike site itself. And then was also
23 what was being seen as sort of the smoking-gun for
24 whether or not there was contamination at the Nike
25 swale. So while not every single one of those was

25

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 sampled -- I don't recall why -- it may have been lack
2 of contamination in one of the drainages -- we got a
3 pretty broad coverage of the various areas where water
4 would come down. But, yeah --

5 MR. COOPER: You're saying that each magazine
6 had a drain pipe that shot water over into the swale?

7 MR. NELSON: Through an underground pipe,
8 right.

9 MS. CHEEVER: At the bottom of the elevator
10 shaft; is that right, Mark?

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Right.

12 MR. COOPER: And by gravity does it drain over
13 into the swale?

14 MR. YOUNGKIN: We don't know whether it's
15 still working. It was never resolved, so that was sort
16 of hanging for us. The water in the magazine could just
17 be sampled too. It's sort of a murky issue. That's why
18 I brought it up. Maybe address that issue too. If the
19 magazines are containing clean water now, what's coming
20 out of those drainage pipes? It's a murky issue.

RAB June 20 2003.txt

21 That's why I brought it up.
22 MR. O'HARA: Isn't that the lowest part of the
23 entire installation?
24 MR. BERMAN: But it's still uphill from the
25 swale a little bit, so it is a possibility that it could

26

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 go by gravity.
2 MR. O'HARA: Okay.
3 MR. ANDERSON: If it's like a [inaudible] it
4 could hold back water but be slowly going through.
5 MR. O'HARA: The water accumulated in those
6 magazines for years. The covers on them didn't work so
7 if it rained there would be water that got into it. At
8 one point they were 75 or 80 percent full of water,
9 weren't they? Apparently, it wasn't draining out, so
10 how effective are those drains? And is anything
11 leaching out or going through a pipe to daylight or
12 something?
13 MR. YOUNGKIN: The other thing that's a
14 possibility is that the magazine is just equilibrated
15 with the groundwater now, so it slowly comes and slowly
16 goes out and stays at the same level where the
17 groundwater would have been before they dug the hole,
18 but there's not really water coming into the ground
19 anymore, but there's still water in there. That water
20 is moving in and out at a slow rate. It equilibrates.
21 It's an interesting, murky topic.
22 MR. NELSON: That's something we have to
23 address at the Nike site itself and probably look at the
24 connection between the magazine and the bottom of the
25 groundwater in that area.

27

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MR. BERMAN: Can you really do this swale plan
2 without connecting it to the issue of the Nike site
3 itself? Does it makes sense to do them as independent
4 studies? Because if you think there's a connection
5 between the two, then wouldn't it make more sense to do
6 them as a unit?
7 MR. NELSON: Well, they're pretty closely
8 scheduled together in terms of land-use. I think the
9 RAP that's been written for those two sites is together.
10 MR. COOPER: Right. They're in the same RAP.
11 We just felt that we just need more characterization
12 data for the Nike swale area. I think your point is
13 correct. If you think we are missing a contaminant
14 pathway --
15 MR. BERMAN: The surface water is a potential
16 contaminant in this case. That's a possible pathway.
17 You know there's water in there, so it seems more
18 logical that the two would be dealt with in some very
19 structured way together rather than dealing with a
20 remedial plan or design for the swale itself.
21 MR. COOPER: I don't know if we can
22 necessarily do them together. If you just figure out
23 all the places where the surface water is running off
24 the Nike site, we need to sample all those locations.
25 MS. TRIGIANI: You're dealing with the Nike

28

CLARK REPORTING
Page 12

RAB June 20 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 facility first, right? That's scheduled ahead of the
2 swale?

3 MR. COOPER: As far as the RAP?

4 MS. TRIGIANI: As far as the work on them.

5 MR. COOPER: Approximately the same time.

6 MS. TRIGIANI: I must be looking at an old --

7 MR. COOPER: You're right. At one point it
8 was. We're trying to move the swale up ahead on the
9 schedule a little bit.

10 MS. TRIGIANI: Got it.

11 MR. NELSON: I think you have to look at a map
12 and see. There's a couple of issues. One of them is
13 that the levels of COC on the site are very low.
14 They're just barely squeaking above the cleanup goal.
15 You're almost at that point where, if you get a
16 connection, there's a great distance between the Nike
17 site and the Nike swale in terms of where the
18 contamination was found. So, hopefully, with the design
19 sampling we can find whether or not it extends up the
20 hill. I just feel, from looking at the site and the
21 layout of it and also dealing with the amount of -- you
22 can't see the out-falls of any of the drains when you're
23 on the hillside below the Nike site. It's covered with
24 iceplant. And so for the water to actually get all the
25 way down to that lower area it would have to be

29

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 transporting a tremendous amount of sediment on a
2 regular basis to really contaminate the soil at high
3 levels. I think what we are putting together will allay
4 some of these concerns, but I certainly welcome comments
5 of how we're going to do this sampling.

6 MR. COOPER: Today I received a letter from
7 the Park Service to issue the draft RAP for Baker Beach
8 3 and 4 and Fill Site 6-A for the regulatory agencies.
9 So I'm taking one last read of it tomorrow. And then
10 we'll give Treadwell & Rollo, our consultant, a green
11 light to go ahead and make copies and mail it out. And
12 that's going to happen. I assume that the regulatory
13 agencies and the RAB reps will receive their copies next
14 week for sure. This is basically -- remember how we did
15 it on 4 and 5? This is the draft before we go public --
16 the official draft for public review. So we're going to
17 follow the same model we had last year. And this is an
18 opportunity for you guys to look at a draft RAP before
19 it goes out for formal public comment.

20 And speaking of when we're hoping to send it
21 out for formal public comment, we basically send it to
22 the regulatory agencies. Next, we'll meet with them.
23 They have some comments, and we'll change that draft RAP
24 and incorporate the agency comments. And then send a
25 draft RAP out again in late July, we hope. That one

30

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 will be the official draft RAP for everyone to comment
2 on. And a proposed plan goes out at the same time when
3 we send out the draft RAP for public comment.

4 We've all talked about the importance of the
5 construction schedule for these projects, especially for
6 the Baker Beach 3 project, which is on the coastal

RAB June 20 2003.txt

7 bluffs. We want to get started on that one before the
8 rainy season. So far, if we keep pushing, I think we're
9 going to make it.

10 MR. KERN: Is Fill Site 6 still in the RAP?
11 Still going ahead with that?

12 MR. COOPER: 6-A. Yes. It sure is.
13 Next one is skeet range. Now, last month
14 Brian was here to talk about the work that was done.
15 That work is still done. And we already sent a kind of
16 conclusion report regarding this work. Now, we are
17 going to send an appendix to that report to describe all
18 the erosion repair work that we've done. So we'll send
19 that off to the regulatory agencies when that gets
20 finished.

21 At Fill Site 7 -- that's a fill site at the
22 Crissy Field operable units. We sent in a request for
23 completion on that particular fill site to DTSC. They
24 are fine with that except for one issue; and that is
25 zinc. So they have asked us to take a better look at

31

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 certain locations on the south edge of the marsh with
2 respect to zinc soils. We are putting together a field
3 sampling plan on that. We'll get that out to the
4 regulatory agencies as soon as we get approval on that.
5 Take some samples and see what the results are and
6 follow whatever the RAP requires us to do with zinc.
7 Okay. Any questions on that?

8 After Baker Beach 3, 4, 6-A RAP, we'll have
9 RAP 3. That particular RAP has about 20 sites in it.
10 I've sent out an e-mail listing the sites that we're
11 projecting for each RAP. It's not an exact science
12 because we have to get regulatory agency approval on
13 that. We are putting lots of sites in RAP 3. And two
14 of the more important and complex sites in that
15 particular RAP are the Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 1 and
16 2. The other two are kind of cliff landfill sites. So
17 we've had a consultant basically do the same thing --
18 figure out how deep the ocean is basically in front of
19 these two landfills so we can figure out whether an
20 ocean-based cleanup is possible or not. Before we can
21 even analyze that particular removal option we needed to
22 get some information first to see if it's even feasible.
23 We've had consultants down there doing the GPS and
24 checking elevations of both the beach and the bottom of
25 ocean right in front of those two sites to see how

32

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 feasible it is bring in a barge or something.

2 MR. BERMAN: Do you know what the depth
3 requirement is for a barge?

4 MR. COOPER: I don't know.

5 MR. BERMAN: Some of them are kind of wide and
6 have ballast in them so they really do not need much
7 depth at all. That's one of the big advantages,
8 presumably.

9 MR. COOPER: But after you put several tons of
10 waste on it, I don't know. That's what their analysis
11 will tell us.

12 MR. BERMAN: Is the idea also to have
13 equipment come in it, the actual excavation equipment,

RAB June 20 2003.txt

14 also be on the barge itself?
15 MR. COOPER: I don't know any details. Before
16 they come in and start digging, they need to get this
17 kind of baseline information before even starting to put
18 more thought into it. A land-based excavation is still
19 definitely in the works, too. So we're going to compare
20 an ocean-based one to a land-based one and come up with
21 a recommendation. There will be more time before we
22 start on those details.
23 MR. BERMAN: Some of those so-called
24 ocean-based excavations are done with land-based
25 equipment that dumps the stuff on the barge so the

33

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 barges themselves don't ever carry the equipment.
2 MR. COOPER: Probably so. Right.
3 So RAP 3 is a very important RAP. It has some
4 important sites in Area A. And we are trying to get
5 ahead of the curve so we're not doing RAPs in the middle
6 of the summer like we did last year -- this year.
7 Fill Site 5 now has a new name -- Sunset
8 Rubble. Mark Frey is a big part of the revegetation
9 efforts there. And our remediation contractor ERRG
10 basically closing out our contract there. And now
11 Treadwell & Rollo is in the process of writing the
12 completion report for both sites right now. And so
13 we'll be sending that to the regulatory agencies.
14 That is how Fill Site 5 looks now. And, Mark,
15 why is there a hole in the landscape fabric there?
16 MR. FREY: We're having a study that involves
17 30 plots of similarly planted plants around the site to
18 assess this process, because no one has ever done this.
19 So we want to know the soil characteristics and light
20 characteristics and plant characteristics and how
21 successful we are at actually restoring landfill sites
22 after they have been excavated.
23 MS. CHEEVER: Do those 30 plots cover the
24 whole area?
25 MR. FREY: No. It's going to remain as the

34

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 original blanket over most of the site until this coming
2 fall, when we have to go in to plant the rest of the
3 site.
4 MR. BERMAN: Where do you get the irrigation
5 water?
6 MR. FREY: The World War II Memorial is right
7 there. There's a big access for water for that. We'll
8 just tie into that same system.
9 MR. BERMAN: Where does that come from?
10 MR. FREY: Lobos Creek.
11 MR. YOUNGKIN: So the asbestos sampling came
12 out clear?
13 MR. COOPER: Yeah. I think that we feel
14 comfortable, that based on our sampling, where we had a
15 little pump and somebody simulating planting and
16 restoration activities, I don't think we found any
17 significant levels of asbestos in the filters in the
18 samples that we took. So a report will be written up.
19 And when we do bring volunteers for site planting I
20 think what we will do is probably tell them that there

RAB June 20 2003.txt

is serpentine soil at some of those sites and serpentine soils do contain asbestos. We tell them the results of our study. And I think that's about all that would be necessary.

MR. YOUNGKIN: What was Fill Site 4 renamed

35

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

as?

MR. NELSON: I don't really get involved in the sites that are around the historic forest.

MR. COOPER: Landfill 4 has not been renamed. You can talk to the historical forester for the Presidio Trust and see if you want to rename that particular site.

But he did send me a very interesting e-mail today. I'm collecting costs for our restoration efforts. And I found that all the trees that were planted there were basically at no cost to the Presidio, that we get them from the City of San Francisco and that when we chip our trees we give them the bark and we got free trees.

Petroleum sites. As you know, we have four big cap sites. First one is 1065. We talked about that in detail at the last RAB committee. And tomorrow the Trust is going to Jim's office to talk about our interim action plan and how we want to do some cleanup in advance of the cap. And Jim had some comments on our interim action plan. We want to talk to him about that so we can get their concurrence later this summer.

At 207-231, that particular cap is the last place right now. We have a draft work plan to plug the data gaps from the Army's work on that particular cap

36

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

site. And so that work plan has been sent. We have sent the work plan out to the regulatory agencies. So not only are we reviewing it but the regulatory agencies are reviewing it too. But that one was kind of bringing up the rear of the cap sites right now.

Commissary PX cap site. That work plan is being implemented. In fact. It is in two phases -- Phase 1 and 2. Both sampling phases have been implemented, and we're now writing up the data report for the second phase of sampling that happened. And that particular data report is going to be sent to the Park Service in July. On the Commissary, hopefully, at the end of the Phase 2 data report that we have a sufficient data set to move cap after that.

MR. KERN: Any major surprises in the data that you collected? Big areas of contamination?

MR. COOPER: I don't think there's any surprises. There are some pretty big areas of contamination. So maybe when that data report comes out we can do a focused discussion on that one, too.

Building 1349 cap near Fill Site 5, just uphill from Fill Site 5. And we did the investigation of that one in two phases also. And we just finished some groundwater monitoring this week so we can now write up the Phase 2 investigation data report and

37

CLARK REPORTING
Page 16

RAB June 20 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 that's going to be prepared by the consultant and sent
2 to us by August. Commissary and Building 1349 caps are
3 chugging along at about the same rate.

4 All right. For tank removals, as you know,
5 there's hardly any tanks left. There were six known
6 tanks left in the ground, but they were all in people's
7 basements, most of them, along Portola. Somebody moved
8 out of a house so we immediately went in before the new
9 tenant moved. We went in there and took the tank out.
10 Now there's only five known tanks left. So when tenants
11 move out of their homes, we'll go in and take those
12 tanks out also.

13 Minicaps. Those are sites where the tanks
14 have been removed but there is some residual soil
15 contamination that needs to be addressed. There's 25
16 known minicap sites. We're doing this in work plans to
17 investigate the residual soil contamination. The first
18 work plan covered ten sites. And that is out with the
19 regulators right now. That's the second set in Group 1
20 draft cleanup plan under regulatory review.

21 The second set of minicap sites, the other 15,
22 we have a work plan to investigate those. That's kind
23 of the internal review phase with the Trust and the Park
24 Service. So we're chugging long with the minicap sites,
25 too.

38

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 As you know, Jim made a presentation last
2 month about the new Regional Board order, which rescinds
3 the two existing orders and kind of sends out a
4 consolidated, streamlined, single, up-to-date order for
5 the Trust to follow. And I am busily putting together
6 my comments on that. The deadline is June 16th. And we
7 will definitely make that deadline. And I look forward
8 to working with Jim on sorting out the Trust comments
9 and working under the new order. I've read it.
10 Overall, I am really happy with the order. It makes a
11 lot of sense to streamline the order. We were concerned
12 about compliance issues on the old order because it got
13 so out of date and a lot of things we were doing were
14 just not in synch with what the old order said. So this
15 new order is going to be really helpful for tracking
16 progress in our petroleum cleanup orders.

17 Groundwater monitoring is moving along. We
18 just finished our second quarter 2003 sampling this
19 week. And the second bullet is about a reduction of
20 certain analytes at certain wells that is under
21 regulatory agency review. We felt that we have a good
22 wealth of data for certain types of analytes at certain
23 wells; and so we proposed a reduction of certain
24 analytes, the frequency of analysis, at certain wells.
25 And the regulators are taking a look at that.

39

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 Our next report is coming along, too.

2 MR. BERMAN: Is there any chance in your
3 thinking that as time progresses that you would go to
4 semi annual instead of quarterly on these?

5 MR. COOPER: Yeah. In fact, Jim is basically
6 championing that idea and his order is recommending

RAB June 20 2003.txt

going from quarterly reporting to semi annual reporting.
So our semi annual report would cover both Q1 and Q2.

MR. NELSON: It's been two full years now
sampling everything quarterly, right?

MR. COOPER: Right.

MR. NELSON: So it's a matter of looking at
that data and comparing it to past trends and seeing
whether or not it makes sense to produce analytes for
core data on the site when you haven't seen them in
eight years. That's the sort of logic that we're
following.

MR. COOPER: We are spending about a million
dollars on this a year, so we're trying to think through
reasonable and sensible ways to save money on this
particular program.

Mustard agent site. The Army is getting close
to doing something, so I'm pretty excited about that.
They called me up and said they actually have hired a
contractor to put together a little work plan. There's

40

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

two issues -- I think everyone knows what I'm talking
about here. There's two issues that the Army has been
tasked to deal with. One is kind of an easy one. If
you go to the site, you will see an area of soil that's
been stockpiled. There's two roll-up bins and then an
area of soil that's been tarped down. The Army needs to
screen that soil and tell the Trust and DTSC whether
there's any other bottles of mustard agent or any other
items of concern that we should know about before we
haul that soil off the site. So if they screen them and
they don't find anything, then the Trust gets rid of it.
And if they do find something, then all bets are off and
we have to go into a different mode and tarps go back.

The second bullet is much the bigger and more
comprehensive issue that the Army is grappling with.
And that is really kind of taking a step back and doing
a Presidio-wide archive search report for weapons and
combat training zone. Bruce Handel came here and gave
an update to the RAB a couple of months ago about that
archive search report. And their consultant has been on
site a couple times. I've met with him a couple times.
I actually feel really good about this. He seems to be
extremely thorough. He's from the St. Louis office of
the Army Corps of Engineers. And I'm just getting a
good feeling that he really is caring about his work

41

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

product. So we'll be seeing it in July. I've asked for
it to be produced, because it's going to be pretty big
document. I've asked for it be in both hard copy and
CD. So we can distribute it a lot easier that way to
everybody. So that particular document will then help
the Army decide the next steps do they need to do in the
fenced area or if there's any other areas outside the
fenced area that -- need to be investigated on this
particular issue. I am happy to see that area moving
along, although it is at a fairly slow pace.

MR. BERMAN: Is there any indication within
your discussions with this consultant that there are
other combat areas that might have to be looked at?

Page 18

RAB June 20 2003.txt

MR. COOPER: I did get one e-mail forwarded from Bruce Handel that he found some documentation that basically alluded to the one that we found. But as far as one outside that, I'll wait for his report to come in. He didn't specify anything to me, but I'll wait for his report.

That's the end of my presentation.

MR. KERN: Any questions for Craig or Chris?

Thanks so much for that report.

Let's move on then to what we have for the rest of the agenda. Bob and Jim, anything?

MR. BOGGS: Just maybe plugging a few new

42

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

issues here. I know you mentioned concern with Fill Site 6-A. Our agency had some concerns. We actually had a meeting last week with the Park Service and the Trust and my management. Basically, we've developed a way to go forward, but the Trust has a few tasks to perform before our agency is going to sign the RAP. Basically, it's just to help assure that the creek becomes daylighted. It's safe to see some daylight at that point. There's going to be a sewer study with some minor amounts of sampling to fill the data gap about that storm drain.

MR. COOPER: That's a good point. There's a series of storm drains that feed into the Tennessee Hollow main storm drain. And I'm going to spend some remediation money to fund the Trust's utility department to double-check to make sure there isn't any sanitary sewer drains that have been accidentally connected into the storm drain pipe feeder system. It will cost about \$20,000, but I think it's well worth the investment to make sure that there isn't some undocumented cross-connection there.

MS. TRIGIANI: How come that's something that doesn't come out of their budget? You're saying --

MR. COOPER: I think it's a matter of we want to get it done. They had done some work on this

43

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

already. They've double-checked that their sanitary system as-built design, as given to them, is hooked as is shown. So all they're doing now is really double-checking undocumented cross-connections.

MS. TRIGIANI: Where did those --

MR. COOPER: I think it's a great investment for not only the moving forward on our 6-A project but for Tennessee Hollow and for the park in general.

MS. TRIGIANI: Is that associated with the residences or businesses or both?

MR. COOPER: Both.

MR. ANDERSON: Is this a physical check or a records check?

MR. COOPER: They will physically walk up the big storm pipe, because it's large. I think they can make it all the way under the YMCA parking-lot. All the other feeder pipes they will use microscopic cameras to check and if they see a pipe that's connected they will check it against their design drawings. If they come across a connection that isn't supposed to be there,

21 then they will do a smoke test and send smoke up that
22 pipe and figure out where that one is going and then cap
23 it off if it's a sanitary sewer connection. There's a
24 visual inspection, but most of it is going to be through
25 the camera.

44

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 MS. TRIGIANI: Who will perform that work?
2 MR. COOPER: The Trust utility crew.
3 MS. TRIGIANI: You don't bring somebody in?
4 MR. COOPER: If we brought in a private
5 contractor, we wouldn't be looking at a \$20,000 job,
6 because they're going to write a report for us.
7 MS. TRIGIANI: I thought \$20,000 seemed low.
8 That's why I was wondering.
9 MR. COOPER: It's something that the Trust
10 really needed to do because there's something called a
11 nifty [phonetic spelling] Phase II permit, which is
12 under the Clean Water Act. That stormwater runoff is
13 being more regulated by Jim's agency. And Phase I was
14 for big cities; and Phase II is for medium-size cities
15 and federal facilities and probably some other stuff
16 too. Our stormwater run-off is going to be formally
17 regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board.
18 We are putting together our permit for our stormwater
19 run-off. One of the things that we're going to have to
20 do is best management practices to show that you're
21 doing the best you can to stop contaminants and
22 pollutants getting into your stormwater run-off. And
23 one of the things that you do to make sure that there
24 isn't any sanitary sewers cross-connected into your
25 stormwater system.

45

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700

1 So we're moving forward on our Fill Site 6-A
2 permit; and it's something that will look good on our
3 application to the Regional Board.
4 MR. BERMAN: Is that issue addressed in the
5 new order?
6 MR. COOPER: It's a different program. No.
7 MR. LEUCKART: Where is the starting point?
8 Where as you're working your way up in the storm system?
9 MR. COOPER: The stormwater drains into the
10 marsh.
11 MR. LEUCKART: Starting where it feeds into
12 the marsh?
13 MR. COOPER: Yep. And then walking up from
14 there.
15 MR. BOGGS: I would add that our agency is
16 working with Jim kind of along these lines at reducing
17 the groundwater program. We actually did some
18 reductions just in the types of wells and how often, but
19 I think it's going to be a larger project actually. It
20 takes a lot of digging in, looking well by well, analyte
21 by analyte, and making those decisions on a very
22 specific basis. So I think it's very good that we're
23 moving forward. In the long run, it will be very
24 cost-effective. It is time-consuming at this point.
25 That's it for me.

46

RAB June 20 2003.txt

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. PONTON: As Craig pointed out, the
2 comments on the Board order are due close of business on
3 Monday. I received some from Mark. And I took a peek
4 at them last week when I first saw them, back from
5 vacation, and looked at them again today. I think for
6 the most part they involved clarification in the
7 findings based on your experience in the site and the
8 stakeholder's experiences on the site. And I called the
9 Army today and the Trust and the Park Service to remind
10 them that comments are due. I left a message for Bruce
11 Handel. I think we met a couple of weeks ago with Bob
12 to talk about the sample reduction. I wrote a letter
13 that our EO signed today granting that reduction in the
14 sampling. And, as you know, there's a lot of reports to
15 be done here.

16 What Craig said about the permits is kind of
17 interesting, because right now I think there's three
18 different groups of people at the Water Board working on
19 the Presidio. I'm working on the cleanup, but there's a
20 person that works on MPDS permits. Then there is
21 another person working on permitting the recycled water
22 plant that's going to at 1065. The water needs to meet
23 certain criteria before it can be spread or applied to
24 irrigation; or it's got to meet certain standards.

25 That's about it for me.

47

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. KERN: Any new business this evening?
2 MS. TRIGIANI: Next week, there's a Presidio
3 Trust board meeting on Tuesday night. Are you guys on
4 the agenda in any way or any of this subject matter on
5 the agenda?

6 MR. COOPER: I've been told I was on the
7 agenda and then that I was off the agenda. It's a
8 public meeting.

9 MS. TRIGIANI: I think they do one or two a
10 year.

11 MS. CHEEVER: I think they're required by law
12 to do two a year.

13 MS. TRIGIANI: Are any RAB members coming?

14 MS. CHEEVER: Actually, there's a lot of other
15 things on that agenda, for example, trails and bikeways.
16 And there's even some trails along the coast that fit in
17 with the remediation. But I don't think you're going to
18 be the focus.

19 MR. KERN: Any other new business?

20 The action items that I have are our five
21 letters that we are putting together. And two possible
22 presentations coming down the road would be Landfills 8
23 and 10 and the Commissary results. Landfill E.

24 MR. LEUCKART: What's the status of the
25 discussion that we had regarding the insurance policy?

48

CLARK REPORTING

(510) 486-0700

1 MR. KERN: As far as I know, the status was
2 that Dave Sutter was doing to consider doing a Freedom
3 of Information Act request. And then he personally
4 decided today not to do it. So I think it's just left
5 out there, as far as I know.

6 MR. DIES: Are you talking about financial

Page 21

RAB June 20 2003.txt
7 recap or the redaction?
8 MR. KERN: The redacted sections. It's kind
9 of lying fallow so far.
10 Any other action items?
11 So the agenda items for the committee meeting:
12 Certainly the letters are going to be the primary thing
13 to be worked out. That we will start assembling ideas
14 for next RAB meeting. One of those presentations
15 perhaps.
16 Any other announcements? Or issues for the
17 group tonight? Very good. Then, without objection,
18 meeting is adjourned. Thank you.
19 [THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:39 P.M.]
20
21
22
23
24
25

♀

49

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700
MEMBERS PRESENT
1
2 Sam Berman
3 Jan Blum
4 Craig Cooper, Presidio Trust
5 George Ford, Presidio Trust
6 Mark Frey, Presidio Trust
7 Joel Hermann
8 Doug Kern
9 Peter O'Hara
10 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Quality Control Board
11 Sara Siegel
12 Mary Trigiani
13 Brian Ullensvang, National Park Service
14 Tracy Wright
15 Mark Youngkin
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

♀

50

CLARK REPORTING
(510) 486-0700
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

RAB June 20 2003. txt

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

⊕

Presidio Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Tuesday, July 8, 2003
MEETING NOTES

ATTENDEES

Agency Members:

Craig Cooper, George Ford – Presidio Trust
Jim Ponton – California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
Bob Bobbs – California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Tony DeStefano – National Park Service (NPS)

Community Members:

Doug Kern – Facilitator/Community Member
Mark Youngkin – Community Co-Chair
Sara Segal
John Budroe
Gloria Glee
Julia Cheever
John Hultgren
Jan Monaghan
Peter O'Hara
David Sutter
Mary Trigiani
Tracy Wright
Jerry Anderson

- 1) Welcome and Introductions – Doug Kern, Facilitator
- 2) Agenda Discussion & Approval
- 3) Announcements, Old Business & Recently Released Documents
- 4) Committee Business & Reports
 - A. Planning Committee Report – Mark Youngkin, Community Co-Chair
 - B. Cost-Reporting Comment Letter – Vote by community members
 - This letter is an effort to distill RAB thoughts into precise recommendations for Trust regarding cost reporting for individual projects.

- The Trust & RAB have come to a consensus and appear to have the same goals. When the issue of developing a cost tracking system was first raised, the Trust felt it could develop a system in-house. However, as the Trust worked through building an internal cost tracking system, they realized they would need help in developing an effective system due to limited staff and resources. Trust is on board with seeking assistance from an outside consultant to assist with upgrading the current cost tracking system.
- Objective of tonight's meeting is to review letter and make comments.

Trust Comments:

The Trust currently tracks regulatory agency costs and public outreach costs separately, but does not track or allocate costs site specifically.

The current cost tracking method would stand up to an audit and maintains the proper paper trail.

Trust agrees with recommendations in letter

The Trust will be able to comment on the letter within 30 days. It will not be a problem to get the process started, but the cost-tracking system will not be fully operational in that time frame.

- Motion to adopt letter. All approved (15 votes)

5) Reports & Discussions

A. Feasibility Study Working Groups – Community Members

- Background. In 1997 the Army presented a Feasibility Study (FS) regarding cleanup in the Presidio which was rejected by the community as inadequate.
- Subsequent to the Army FS, the Trust produced it's own FS (the Revised Feasibility Study for Main Installation Sites) with a comprehensive re-look and additional field sampling.
- The RAB has prepared a draft letter to the Trust outlining their comprehensive review of the Trust FS. The letter is organized into geographic areas and provides recommendations regarding the environmental cleanup of the Presidio.

- Discussion of the Landfill E section regarding the sentence “We recommend that the Trust focus on clean closure as the mission of remediation and seek to manage the cleanup process in a way that yields funds that can be applied to other Presidio projects after CERCLA-based obligations are met.” Decision made to revise the sentence to include “CERCLA-based and other regulatory obligations”.
- Discussion of the Tennessee Hollow Watershed Area section. Question posed by members of the community to Doug Kern about the omission of the sentence “we recommend that the Presidio Trust public affairs team consult with the RAB on....” Doug Kern omitted the sentence because he thought it could be misconstrued and that the RAB meetings provide the forum for the Trust to brainstorm with the community regarding environmental remediation at the Presidio. Response by several community members was that the RAB does not go through the arduous process of writing a final comment letter very often and that it was important to clearly state the importance of community input prior to implementation of remedies.
- Mention of positive article in S.F. Chronicle on clean closure of Presidio landfills.
- Discussion regarding the Lobos Creek Watershed Area section. Questions posed by RAB to Trust regarding whether the findings of chemical of concern (COCs) in the sediment warrant further investigation due to the site being a source of drinking water. Trust responded that data from the five year review concerning impacts to groundwater related to Landfills 8 through 10 (not yet released) indicate that concentrations are less than clean-up levels, are within the range of concentrations of naturally occurring metals, and are below site clean-up levels and drinking water standards. Therefore no further action is warranted for purposes of the remediation program, however this does mean that Lobos Creek will never be looked at again.
- Discussion regarding re-estimation of Battery Howe Wagner costs. RAB community members stated that the remedy at the site not be based on cost alone as clean closure has a value in itself. It was recommended that the text be revised to state “In view of the ambiguity of cost and admitted value of clean closure, we recommend clean closure be considered at Battery Howe Wagner.”
- Motion and vote to approve letter as amended. (all 16 voters in favor)

B. Draft Remedial Action Plan (RAP) for Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 3 & 4 and Fill Site 6A

- DTSC is currently conducting a pre-review of the CEQA portion (initial study/negative declaration) of RAP prior to public comment period. Learned from last years process of allowing the public comment period to begin before receiving pre-review comments from DTSC.
- Proposed Plan Fact Sheet to inform people of the public comment period. Public notice in local newspapers (Bay Guardian, Presidio Post, Trust website, etc) will kick-off 30 day period before the end of July and will be concurrent with other outreach programs. Target date for public meeting is August.
- Review timeline by DTSC. Comments to proposed plan fact sheet expected this week. Bob Boggs has been notified that he may be affected by agency cutbacks but thinks comments on the RAP will squeak through before any cutbacks occur. Question posed as to whether it is worth drafting a letter from the RAB or Trust about how cutbacks may affect the Trust goal. RAB decided that no letter from the RAB on this issue was warranted at this time.
- Discussion about how to support Trust in presenting costs to public for clean closure of Baker Beach Disturbed Areas 3 & 4 and Fill Site 6A (approximately 8 million dollars total). If regulatory agencies are not requiring clean closure, the public may question why spend the additional money (e.g., decision to clean up to higher levels to avoid land use controls). The RAP will allow the Trust to go back to recreational level clean-up goals if the residential levels create problems.

C. Landfill E Field Data Report – Presidio Trust

- Presentation of Landfill E Field Data Report (handout of presentation slides)
- Trust is currently in the process of retaining a new consulting firm to prepare a Focused FS and RAP for Landfill E. High profile project will require a step wise process to gain RAB and regulatory input along the way.

D. Project Status Update – Presidio Trust

Presidio-wide Projects
Petroleum Program Update
On-going Projects

6) Regulatory Agency Status Updates/Inputs

Robert Boggs, California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Jim Ponton, California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)

7) New Business

8) Review of Action Items

9) Agenda for upcoming Committee Meeting & RAB meeting
Discussion of outreach from RAP sites
RAB or Trust Letter associated with State layoffs

10) Closing

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

SEPTEMBER 9, 2003
7:00 p.m.
---oOo---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201
BERKELEY, CA 94704
510 486-0700

♀

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2 MR. KERN: Welcome everyone. This is the
Page 1

3 regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration
4 Advisory Board. I would like to welcome tonight the
5 Presidio Trust and their contractors to the meeting; the
6 National Park Service, our regulatory community and the
7 Presidio RAB community members. Welcome tonight,
8 particularly any members of the public that are here,
9 thank you for coming out and being with us tonight to
10 talk about the Presidio cleanup issues.

11 Hope everyone has an agenda. There is some over on
12 the table. Are there any changes or additions to the
13 agenda tonight? I can mention that item 5A was added
14 recently, and we have Terri with us tonight. And so if
15 you'd all like to continue having that on the agenda, I
16 think it would be a worthwhile thing to review. So
17 without objection, we'll have Item 5A.

18 Any other additions or changes? Any announcements?
19 We do know that Joel may be going to Italy. Committee
20 business. Mark has not yet arrived. He gave me a call
21 during the previous meeting. He's on a bus somewhere.
22 So we'll hold off for that.

23 Membership committee reports.

24 MS. MONAGHAN: I've contacted the five
25 potential new members. And one person, David Weber,

3

1 said he couldn't participate at this time but would be
2 interested in the future. And Sam Allen, Karen Cleek,
3 Carol Mason and Michelle Passero are all interested.
4 And Michelle is here tonight. Karen might be able to
5 come tonight, and then the other two people will come to
6 the committee meeting. So we should have a slate for a
7 vote in October.

8 MR. KERN: Very good. Thanks for getting all
9 that accomplished.

10 The Rules Committee. Discussion of proposed
11 changes to the RAB Bylaws. I know that Mark and Julie
12 had worked on this and sent it out for review. Mark
13 asked me to delay that particular thing until he got
14 here. So we're waiting on Mark again for Item A and C.
15 How many people have reviewed the proposed changes?
16 Anybody?

17 Let's move on to Item 5A, and that would be
18 restoration of remediation sites with Terri Thomas from
19 the Presidio Trust.

20 MS. THOMAS: Good evening. It's great to be
21 here tonight with you all. It's a good chance to show
22 this presentation to you right after the public meeting
23 that just occurred, and to let you know that the
24 restoration of the remediation site occurs in the same
25 way that the Vegetation Management Plan identifies.

4

1 Vegetation Management Plan was a joint document that was
2 created with National Park Service and the Presidio
3 Trust that identified areas in the Presidio of historic
4 forest, natural areas, and landscape zones, and that any
5 of those areas would be designed and landscaped as that
6 area would suggest.

7 This shows the historic forest in dark green, the
8 natural areas in light green and the landscaped areas in
9 the whitish color with the remediation sites overlay
10 with the red outline. We have a very exciting
11 opportunity here in the natural areas to restore

12 remediation sites in a manner that actually restores an
13 ecologic process. And so that's kind of the approach
14 that we take in the natural areas.

15 The guiding documents that we use aren't only the
16 Vegetation Management Plan. We also make sure when we
17 make these restoration sites that we're in compliance
18 with the General Management Plan and the National Park
19 Service, the Presidio Trust Management Plan and the
20 Presidio Trails and Bikeways Master Plan. So any
21 trails, overlooks, view corridors, benches, picnic
22 areas, they're all kind of guided by these documents
23 first. And then we go in from that standpoint and go on
24 to restoration of any of those different areas.

25 Now in particular, the natural areas restoration

♀

5

1 takes a lot of time. And one of the reasons I wanted to
2 be here tonight was to give you all an idea that it's
3 not going to look exactly like a forest or a beautiful
4 area all at once. As you can see, it sometimes takes up
5 to year 12 to have a really good ecological community
6 restored. And the planning needs to take place before
7 construction.

8 You see this kind-of red area there, that's the
9 remediation construction. We need to start a good two
10 years before to think about what plants need to be grown
11 because all of the plants that go into any restoration
12 sites in natural areas are collected from the genetic
13 source right here on the Presidio. So all the seeds are
14 collected right here, and they're grown right here to
15 maintain the genetic integrity of our natural areas. So
16 we have to start planning way ahead, but we have to wait

17 to finish planning until after remediation because we
18 don't really know what the template is for what we're
19 going to restore on until after remediation. So
20 oftentimes the revegetation will take two phases because
21 we have to take the time to collect the propagules, grow
22 the plants, and we need to kind of do that over a
23 two-year period in order to complete the entire site.
24 So a lot of times you'll only see half of the site done
25 at a time.

♀

6

1 Now Fill Site 6, the upper picture, is today, and
2 the lower picture is the artist's rendering that Craig
3 has in the front of the room on what it could look like
4 in the future. Now the interesting thing about Fill
5 Site 6 is that it straddles the landscape zone and the
6 natural zone. So this side of Fill Site 6 is in the
7 natural zone, and it will be restored into a creek
8 corridor as identified in previous plans. And that
9 creek corridor is kind of restricted by a culvert coming
10 into the site and the culvert going out of the site. In
11 that area we will be restoring an Arroyo Willow habitat
12 and some Bullrush Wetlands habitat. And then as it goes
13 up in the uplands, they'll be some Oak Woodland and
14 Coastal scrub.

15 Then when the area gets to right about where those
16 tall redwood trees that are remaining on the site, the
17 redwood trees remain, but there are some scrubby trees,
18 acacias, that will be replaced with similar-height trees
19 like oaks and willows. So you can see that the scale of
20 the trees really isn't any higher or more disjunct than

21 it is today and it would be in the future.

22 We really want to invite the public into the site,
23 in the landscaped areas. So we're making a real
24 inviting presence with a trail, a meadow area, some
25 benches. It should be a nice invitation to people to

7

1 come onto the site.

2 Now, at Disturbed Areas 3 and 4, the upper picture
3 again is today, and the lower pictures, the artist's
4 rendering, which is also now the actual pictures up
5 front as well. In this site, there's a very exciting
6 opportunity to restore the dune plant community to the
7 site, and the restoration goal is to establish an early
8 successional dune area. So there will be some open
9 sand, and it will be an early successional. Like there
10 will be annuals and smaller plants there.

11 There is a good reason for that, and that is that a
12 lot of the rare and expanding endangered plants in our
13 dune system actually surround this site, and by opening
14 the area up to early succession, some of those species
15 can increase in their population. So that's one of the
16 objectives there.

17 Then there's the lower area of Disturbed Area 3.
18 There's a little wetland area which we anticipate will
19 expand after remediation and that will have some dune
20 wetland species in it. And finally, because there are
21 some concerns about erosion on the site, there will be
22 dense shrub that will be in places where there may be
23 more tendency towards erosion, like up near the road
24 edge and at the top of the swale that comes up, that
25 there might be some erosion. And any other identified

1 areas where there could be some increased erosion will
2 have stronger areas of Coastal Scrub that will maintain
3 those.

4 Now what I wanted to do briefly was take you
5 through the implementation process because there's been
6 a lot of questions about what the site would look like
7 kind of over time. So I wanted to let you know that our
8 implementation process is a joint process with the Park
9 Service, Presidio Trust, and the Parks Conservancy.
10 They changed names on me.

11 Initially, when the site is first remediated, our
12 first concern is going to be erosion control. And the
13 treatment for erosion control is not always very
14 aesthetic. So there are areas where you'll have this
15 black landscape fabric that is there to reduce weeds,
16 which are a major threat to ecological restoration. And
17 then you'll also have rice straw or some other
18 erosion-control measures.

19 Now you have to realize some of this might be on
20 there for two years because it could be in some cases
21 that it'll take two years for us to have the plants to
22 come in and plant the site. So it's temporary, but it
23 may be more long term than people would like to see it.
24 But it does go away.

25 Then during this time, it takes 18 months from the

1 time we tell the nursery what plants we want 'til the
2 time we have those plants to put them in the ground. So

3 we have to tell people 18 months ahead of time and
4 there's not really a fast Change Order. If you have a
5 Change Order, it takes a long time if you decide on a
6 different plant species.

7 This is done in collaboration with school kids
8 coming in on Tuesdays and propagating plants, and on
9 Wednesdays and Saturdays the community can volunteer to
10 do this. It's actually a very fun event to participate
11 in.

12 But even once these plants are grown, they're
13 planted out on site hopefully in the fall or the late
14 fall, early winter when the rains can act as a natural
15 irrigation system. We're not very interested in
16 irrigating during the summer like we needed to at Fill
17 Site 5 this year. We don't want to do that as a rule.
18 We'd like to wait until the fall rains.

19 So that's another reason that sometimes you might
20 see a longer period of erosion control because we need
21 to wait for the natural irrigation to happen. And then
22 when that happens, the plants are planted small. You
23 don't really see a nice full landscaped area. They're
24 planted small because we have a higher survivorship of
25 our plants when you plant them small, and they can grow

10

1 in their environment and become adapted to their
2 environment instead of growing in a nice, lush, cushy
3 greenhouse and then be put out into the harsh elements.
4 So we need to plant the plants small but sometimes that
5 unfortunately doesn't allow for the best aesthetics.
6 But it is the best, most cost effective and ecologically
7 effective way to do it.

8 Those plants also need temporary protection. So
9 there will be protective barriers up until those plants
10 become mature. Like you saw in the timeline, that's for
11 some time. It is expected that in general we'll be able
12 to take down the protective barriers eventually, but
13 there will be some cases where that's not possible for
14 either human health reasons or any special sensitive
15 ecological area.

16 And then weeding keeps going, and it just keeps
17 going and it just keeps going. And finally after a few
18 years you have a more mature community. This is an
19 Arroyo Willow Wetland community that we're hoping will
20 be one of the communities at Fill Site 6. The Coastal
21 Scrub community is one of the maturest communities that
22 will be at Disturbed Areas 3 and 4.

23 The final thing I'll say is that we actually have,
24 if you're more interested in kind of what the historic
25 areas, landscaped areas and natural areas are and what's

11

1 happening in the Presidio, hot off the presses I've put
2 a stack of these Open Space Updates. You can take a
3 look and there's phone numbers and stuff to comment if
4 you have any questions or comments on this. Thank you
5 very much. If anybody has questions or thoughts?

6 MS. BLUM: Terri, with respect to the process
7 you just outlined, I know that the public doesn't have a
8 good feeling for that. Will you be placing any
9 educational signs at these fill sites? People actually
10 read those signs, like Sunset Scrub. They actually read
11 them when they come upon them. But a lot of people are

12 complaining about the Presidio Trust and the Park
13 Service because they don't really understand the
14 process. They don't know how long it's going to take to
15 look good, and so on. So I'm wondering, do you have any
16 plans to put educational signage out or those kiosks or
17 whatever in some of these sites?

18 MS. THOMAS: We will now. I'll make a note and
19 we'll talk about it.

20 MS. BLUM: You know, "this is what it will look
21 like four years down the road," or something, like you
22 did with Crissy Field.

23 MR. COOPER: I think we have plans for signage,
24 the same thing that we did for Landfill 4 and Fill Site
25 5. We put up some signs before the construction

12

1 started, a couple months before, and then I think after
2 the construction finished, we changed out the signs and
3 put up the signs that you see now about what's going on
4 now. So there will probably be two sets of signage.

5 MS. BLUM: I think it would be really helpful
6 from the get-go to say, "It's going to take five years,
7 but this is possibly what it might look when it's
8 finished." And then give whatever your key explanation
9 of the process is in the meantime. Give somebody a
10 picture about how long it's going to take to look good
11 again because it's going to look bad for a long time.
12 Empty.

13 MR. COOPER: Right.

14 MR. BUDROE: Just out of curiosity, say ten
15 years down the road, if in the restoration sites you've
16 got a bunch of invasive nonnatives, do you have any

17 strategy -- what would the Trust do about that kind of
18 thing at that point?

19 MS. THOMAS: Five years down the road?

20 MR. BUDROE: Ten years down the road. A ways.

21 MS. THOMAS: Well, I would hope that we never
22 let it get that bad. The history here at the Presidio
23 in restoration has been pretty solid. We know the
24 weeds. We know what's coming in, and we've so far been
25 able to treat them in our restoration sites. So I'm

13

1 really hoping it would never get to Year 10 and it's
2 overwhelming. I'm really hoping we would be able to
3 keep that going, as we are today, and make sure we don't
4 get overwhelmed. If it happens, I'm not sure. We'll
5 have to deal with it then. We'll ask for a lot of
6 expertise from a lot of people who are experts in the
7 field on how to approach it.

8 MR. BUDROE: But you're looking at it as an
9 ongoing monitoring.

10 MS. THOMAS: Oh, yeah. That's why the timeline
11 showed 12 years because after we've actually done the
12 initial construction of restoration, which we figure is
13 four years, then there's five years of maintenance and
14 monitoring, which we still have budgeted, and then after
15 that, there is another seven years of stewardship, and
16 that's an ongoing weeding project. So really, every
17 project in natural resources for a restoration site is a
18 12-year project. It has the initial planning and plant
19 propagation all the way to maintenance. And then even
20 after maintenance we have what we call stewardship,

21 which is we still visit the site every year and weed it.

22 MR. SUTTER: Terri, on the bluff areas, what is
23 the status of iceplants as far as your program is
24 concerned?

25 MS. THOMAS: In the coastal bluffs? We weed

14

1 it.

2 MR. SUTTER: So it's not native?

3 MS. THOMAS: Yes.

4 MS. BLUM: Just one other suggestion on the
5 site, if you're not already going to do this, please put
6 down, "If you'd like to volunteer for a restoration
7 program," and put the number on the sign.

8 MS. THOMAS: Will do.

9 MR. ANDERSON: David just commented on the
10 iceplant being nonnative and therefore you don't want it
11 around. But in your historic forest projects, you talk
12 about 40 percent of the forest being eucalyptus. You
13 talk about the pine and cypress dying out, but there is
14 no word about the plans for the eucalyptus which is also
15 nonnative.

16 MS. THOMAS: Right. When David asked that, I
17 was really referring to the Coastal Bluffs. In the
18 areas of landscape planting and forestry, there's kind
19 of a little bit different criteria. And if they find
20 that ice plant is part of the historic landscape in some
21 of those areas that aren't adjacent to natural areas
22 where it would become weeded, then that would also maybe
23 be considered an all-right thing to have, just like
24 eucalyptus trees are considered part of the historic
25 forest.

1 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: There is a (INAUDIBLE)
 2 replaced as part of the management of the historic
 3 forest right now.
 4 MS. THOMAS: The historic forest is going
 5 through a specific study called a Characterization Study
 6 where they're looking at what is the realm of making the
 7 historic forest historic. I mean, does it have to be
 8 the exact species? Can it be any species of, say,
 9 eucalyptus? And that's why at Landfill 4 we actually
 10 planted four different species of eucalyptus to see if
 11 one of them might be able to have a visual similarity to
 12 Eucalyptus Globulus, which is the one I think you're
 13 referring to, and yet wouldn't be as invasive or as
 14 messy.
 15 MR. ANDERSON: Yeah. It seems like as a
 16 nonnative, non-historic species, it has terrible
 17 characteristics, so you're looking around for something
 18 that's exactly like it but doesn't have those
 19 characteristics. The whole process just seems a little
 20 bizarre.
 21 MS. THOMAS: I can understand that.
 22 MR. KERN: Any other questions for Terri?
 23 MR. LUIKART: Just as a followup, can you
 24 elaborate at all on the criteria for determining what
 25 stays and what doesn't?

1 MS. THOMAS: As far as the historic forest
 2 goes?

3 MR. LUIKART: Sure.

4 MS. THOMAS: Sure, I can do that. In 1886, a
5 gentleman named Colonel Jones began a plan that finished
6 in the 1890s which identified very specifically criteria
7 that he was putting into a landscape plan to create a
8 forest on the Presidio. It had things like make a
9 border along the Presidio to heighten the ridge top. So
10 he planted on the ridge top to make the government seem
11 stronger; in a way to seem larger.

12 He had very, very specific things. And at the time
13 Golden Gate Park was very successful at planting three
14 major species. So they planted with those three
15 species: Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress and Blue Gum
16 Eucalyptus. Then it was implemented and those trees
17 grew up. We identified the as-built as the first aerial
18 photograph, which is in 1935/1936. And so we used that
19 as-built, which was the first aerial photograph, to
20 define what we call the historic forest. Everything
21 that's grown outside of that historical forest since
22 then is not. And there's actually quite a bit of forest
23 that will be removed to restore the natural areas based
24 on that 1935 photograph, and the areas that are in
25 historic forest in that photograph will be restored to

17

1 whatever character the National Historic Preservation
2 Act folks determine is historic to the Presidio.

3 MR. LUIKART: So you are taking it back to a
4 point in time, which is 1888.

5 MS. THOMAS: Which is actually 1935.

6 MR. LUIKART: 1935. A result of the '88
7 action.

8 MS. THOMAS: Yeah. I think it was more in the
9 '90s. He started building in the late '80s.

10 MR. LUIKART: And using the 1935 photograph is,
11 I guess, justified or is reconciled on what basis, as
12 opposed to any other alternative?

13 MS. THOMAS: Oh, okay. Because of that plan,
14 what got implemented was never documented. There was
15 never an as-built to the plan. And since that time,
16 there have been a lot of Arbor Days. So there's been a
17 lot of plantings outside of that. What we were really
18 interested in was making sure that Major Jones' intent
19 was documented here, was demonstrated here. And the
20 earliest as-built that we had was that 1935 photo.

21 MR. LUIKART: Let me ask it differently. Why
22 that plan as opposed to 1765 or 1600 or whenever you
23 could determine what other native plants might have been
24 there at the prior time?

25 MS. THOMAS: That was the original plan from

18

1 the Army, with the intent of the Army, and that's what
2 we're documenting.

3 MR. LUIKART: Okay. We're using the Army's
4 original.

5 MS. THOMAS: Right. Correct.

6 MS. TRIGIANI: How do you know that it wasn't
7 Major Jones' intent to have it grow out of control, or
8 is that not the issue? Do you know what I'm saying?

9 MS. THOMAS: Right. I don't know how much you
10 guys want me to go into this. There is something in
11 the Historic Preservation Act. There was one thing that

12 Major Jones wrote a plan that we want to document here
13 on site. However, he also said in that plan, for
14 example, that he would thin -- the plants could be
15 planted on 10-foot centers, but you would thin them
16 through time. Well, they were never thinned. So if you
17 look in the Presidio forest where it looks like it's in
18 rows and they're thin way up and way up high, that's not
19 a healthy forest. But it was that way because they
20 never thinned it. But that is now the historic forest.
21 So it isn't exactly just how Jones intended it. It's
22 also how it expressed itself in the landscape over time
23 that created the historic look that now is the visual
24 characteristics that everybody thinks of as the Presidio
25 forest.

♀

19

1 MR. LUIKART: So therefore, the plantings that
2 you have there now in those wonderful orderly rows that
3 are 10 feet apart, you're going to thin them. It's
4 you're intent to thin them.

5 MS. THOMAS: And that is what the
6 Characterization Study is going to tell us. Once it's
7 complete, which it is not yet, it'll tell us in what
8 areas we can use oaks instead of eucalyptus, in what
9 areas we can thin to 30 feet instead of 10 feet. In
10 other words, it will kind of designate separate sites of
11 the Presidio Forest, and what's acceptable in those
12 sites as far as diversifying the forest or keeping it
13 exactly the way it looks now.

14 MR. KERN: Thanks, Terri. Thanks to all of you
15 for your questions.

16 Let's move back to Mark. We have Item 4A, which is
Page 16

17 the Planning Committee Report, which we've waited for
18 you.

19 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you. Sorry I'm late. We
20 had our Planning Committee meeting on August 26th. The
21 topics we discussed were membership. Did you already
22 discuss that tonight already? We had a discussion of
23 the insurance policy. We decided to work on that some
24 more in the September Planning Committee meeting. We
25 had a long and rowdy discussion on the Mountain Lake

20

1 storm drains and restoration, a continuing discussion.
2 I think we're talking about that some more tonight. We
3 also talked about the Building 1065 ORC issue, and
4 George gave us a nice diagram and explanation of the ORC
5 issue. And our next committee meeting is on September
6 23rd, fourth Tuesday of the month. Hope everybody can
7 make it.

8 MR. KERN: Any questions about the committee
9 meeting? So then we are on to the Rules Committee,
10 discussion of the Bylaws changes.

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Julian and I have been working
12 on the Bylaw changes. I have a handout here I can pass
13 around. It's the same as the E-mail that I sent around,
14 I believe, I hope. What this is all about is we spent a
15 lot of time writing the Bylaws about two to three years
16 ago now. It's been a lot of work. It turned out to be
17 a good document for us.

18 In the ensuing years, we found some areas where
19 there's been some minor problems with the bylaws. An
20 example would be it specifies that we meet at the Golden

21 Gate Club. Well, we no longer meet at the Golden Gate
22 Club. I gave Julian a list of areas I thought were out
23 of date or had some discrepancy in them and some
24 suggestions. And Julian worked up some proposed wording
25 to change those areas. And that's what's in this

21

1 handout that I just passed out to you.

2 In general, I'd just like to say these are pretty
3 much fine-tuning comments, fine-tuning adjustments.
4 There's no real major changes of anything. All the
5 sections are the same. If anybody has any questions on
6 them now, I can answer those. But I'd like you to look
7 over this material. At the committee meeting we can
8 work up these suggested changes into a final copy of the
9 revised Bylaws, and the next RAB meeting we can vote on
10 the proposed changes to the Bylaws.

11 MR. KERN: Sounds like a good plan.

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: I really don't want to try to
13 vote on it tonight because nobody has had a chance to
14 look at this. Does anybody have any questions right off
15 the bat about this? Fire away.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Mark, is this handout identical
17 to the E-mail version?

18 MR. YOUNGKIN: It should be. I may have
19 formatted it just to fit the three pages, to print it
20 out, but the content is the same.

21 MR. KERN: Thanks to you and Julian for
22 preparing this. It's lot of work. This document has
23 been used actually as a model across the country by
24 different RABS. We get requests for it all the time.
25 And so the process of finetuning it and making it up to

1 date is really a credit to the organization. So thanks
2 to you guys for doing that work. It will benefit if
3 people read this. If you spot anything, they'll be
4 quite open to your comments. So thanks.

5 MR. YOUNGKIN: Plus any other areas of the
6 Bylaws that anybody has a problem with, now is a good
7 time to bring it up.

8 MR. COOPER: We E-mail our comments to Mark or
9 just bring them up at the committee meeting, or either
10 way?

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: Either way.

12 MS. BLUM: Mark, I have a question about
13 quorums. Is a quorum based on the amount of members
14 that show up at a meeting?

15 MR. YOUNGKIN: Yes.

16 MS. BLUM: Okay. Is it 60 percent?

17 MR. YOUNGKIN: There's actually a formula in
18 the Bylaws. It's roughly 51 percent.

19 MS. BLUM: The handwriting is on the wall.

20 MR. KERN: That's a really good question. It
21 was thoroughly thought about, and there were different
22 numbers of people for different kinds of items. So it's
23 fairly interesting.

24 MS. BLUM: Flexible?

25 MR. KERN: No. I mean, it's to attempt to -- I

1 guess for voting -- like different examples, major
2 voting things, like voting on new members I think might

3 be different than having a quorum for a meeting. So we
4 didn't want to prevent us from actually not being able
5 to have a meeting, versus if you're going to change the
6 Bylaws or vote on something important, it was a stricter
7 standard.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: But if you do have a lot of
9 members that don't attend meetings, it's harder to reach
10 the quorum, if there's what you're getting at.

11 MS. BLUM: I was just interested in the
12 floating quorum numbers. I think it's great. You can
13 always have a meeting and make a decision.

14 MR. HULTGREN: Well, it doesn't really float.
15 If you look at (INAUDIBLE). 51 percent of the community
16 members rounded up for a period. It only floats if you
17 have a difference in the community members. But it
18 doesn't vary depending on what kind of an issue you're
19 voting on. That's a whole different issue, a whole
20 other subject.

21 MR. YOUNGKIN: I may have misunderstood your
22 original question.

23 MR. HULTGREN: In other words, you have to have
24 a quorum before you can do anything official, period.
25 If you have a quorum, then you can look at the issue and

24

1 decide what kind of a vote it requires. I'm not sure,
2 but I think it depends on the vote of the people who are
3 present to vote. But you've got achieve a quorum first.
4 Does that help?

5 MR. KERN: All right. That's a great plan, and
6 thanks again to you guys for doing that. Before we have
7 a break, we can still possibly tackle the next item

8 because it's like this previous one. And we're now on
9 5D, Mountain Lake Resolution.

10 We're not going to be voting to really introduce
11 this topic. The first discussion that we had, as Mark
12 mentioned, was at our last committee meeting in August,
13 and the subject has been floating out there for a long
14 time. Mountain Lake has been a topic of this board for
15 the whole process of the RAB which is now ten years old.
16 But recently in the last couple of years, there's been
17 an interest to try to move the thing ahead and to really
18 cut to the chase.

19 One of the major issues that we have is the cleanup
20 responsibility, and one of the parties kind of not
21 coming to the table, and how all of us working in
22 partnership are going to try to move this project ahead.
23 And so there was a lot of things discussed at our
24 meeting, and so I came up with the idea of trying to
25 distill that into a resolution, and I threw that out

25

1 there on the E-mail. I've gotten some comments back. I
2 know that the resolution has been distributed somewhat
3 outside the RAB in addition. So we're already getting
4 some feedback. And it's causing not necessarily
5 concern, but the group has some credibility. So we know
6 if we're going to begin a process, people want to be
7 heard about what we're considering. And so that's just
8 a little background, this resolution and our thoughts
9 carry some weight.

10 Perhaps before I hand out the resolution to begin
11 sort of talking about it, we can at least cover again

12 what the issue is. We have Mountain Lake, the cleanup
 13 and restoration kind of happening simultaneously, the
 14 planning for that. So part of the Presidio Trust is
 15 planning for the cleanup and the dredging, and there are
 16 teams assigned to do that. There are contractors
 17 working on that. In addition, there are other members
 18 of the Park Service and the Parks Conservancy and the
 19 National Park Service working on the design for
 20 restoration.

21 It's kind of overlapping because a major problem
 22 for the lake was that it was filling up with sediment
 23 due to a variety of conditions, perhaps too much
 24 nutrients and additional sediment. So the lake was
 25 unhealthy. Too shallow. So in the investigation of

26

1 getting rid of that, additional toxic contamination was
 2 found, and so now we have a combined cleanup and
 3 restoration project.

4 Well, that has been languishing in some ways due to
 5 basically Caltrans saying we're not really going to play
 6 in this game. As RAB members, we've been waiting in the
 7 background to sort of see how this would unfold. It's
 8 our understanding that attorneys have consulted with
 9 each other and mostly done what they do and butted heads
 10 and not achieve much results. No offense to the
 11 attorneys in the room, particularly our illustrious
 12 Julian who has prepared such a great stellar document,
 13 Bylaws.

14 Part of our discussion is: Okay, so this is going
 15 on and on and on. What can we as RAB members do? And
 16 we can basically raise a fuss and organize ourselves and

17 all the community members start pounding tables in a
18 serene and organized way that we usually do to achieve
19 the proper results in coordination with the agencies
20 that we're trying to support.

21 And so that's kind of the issue. And so we
22 produced a resolution, which I'll hand out now, which
23 begins to try to open that discussion up. It's not a
24 very, I guess, specific resolution, but it kind of shows
25 what our intent is. And I've modified it even as late

27

1 at today. You'll notice at the bottom there's a new
2 date and a Version 1.3 at the bottom. The first E-mail
3 was 1.0.

4 MS. TRIGIANI: Maybe somebody else would feel
5 more comfortable answering this. What's the alternative
6 to not doing anything?

7 MR. KERN: I guess the alternative is to allow
8 things to go as they're going to go, which is unclear
9 what that would be. It could languish for years. We
10 know that the Trust is engaged in both those planning
11 processes and they have consultants. They're working on
12 their plans. But it's also part of -- sort of this mix
13 that the Trust does not necessarily want to commit to
14 the cleanup of this potentially expensive site without
15 possibly getting funding from a responsible party, or
16 the assurance that that could be there. They're not
17 coming to the table. So that could be a stalemate that
18 could potentially just go on for years. It seems
19 appropriate that the public weigh in to help out where
20 we see fit. So that's kind of why this would be a

21 starting place.

22 MR. ANDERSON: Did you say comments had come
23 back from outside?

24 MR. KERN: Yeah. The outside comments were
25 basically acknowledging that this was a very neat idea.

28

1 It's one of the organizations that is very keenly
2 involved in the restoration, not the cleanup, of
3 Mountain Lake. They recognize that the RAB could begin
4 a process potentially prematurely and get the support
5 going, and they wouldn't be ready with all their plans.
6 So to be specific about what I've changed, the two "be
7 it further resolved that" at the bottom, we had "the RAB
8 will encourage its individual members to inform and
9 organize." I've inserted, "at the appropriate time in
10 the near future," which is really put in there to say
11 we're going to try and coordinate and do this exactly at
12 the right time. So when we gear everybody up to start
13 pounding on tables and doors and windows, that the
14 agencies will be ready, and they'll be ready. "Hey,
15 what are you doing?" It won't be that sort of
16 situation. So that's the specific change, and it was
17 recognized and appreciated that we had begun this
18 process to move things along.

19 MR. SUTTER: Doug, as far as this draft is
20 concerned, when do you want to receive RAB comments on
21 this?

22 MR. KERN: It seems that in talking to one of
23 our RAB members, John, who is familiar with the
24 legislative calendar, there's a window, January-February
25 timeframe of getting things on the legislative calendar

1 if we decide to go with having a full legislation to get
2 this agency to move. So six months kind of timeframe to
3 get all that prepared and people on board and organized
4 and fully informed. And that's about the timeframe that
5 other organizations are looking to have their plans
6 together.

7 So we have some time to get this going, this
8 resolution, but it also seems there may be other tasks
9 in front of us to begin thinking about legislation,
10 crafting it, drafting it, talking to people what would
11 be in that legislation. Whether we use it or not will
12 be a decision -- I mean, hopefully what will happen is
13 that somebody in the legislature will simply call up the
14 right person at Caltrans and say, "I have a constituency
15 that is beating down my door. Get this to happen." And
16 there won't be any legislation. We'll just do the way
17 it works. But they'll have to know that we're ready,
18 and that we have all the support, and all that.

19 MR. SUTTER: Yeah. I thought I'd just follow
20 up. I understand the legislative process. John laid
21 that out very clearly at the last committee.

22 I guess two questions. No. 1, what is the intended
23 use of this resolution, and secondly, when should we
24 have this resolution finalized?

25 MR. KERN: I would say the intended use is

1 already revealing itself. It's one to let people
2 outside of this group know that we're about to do

3 something, and this is our intent, and this is what we
4 think we're going to do. It kind of guides us as to
5 what we're going to do. We're going to ask the Trust to
6 get their teams together and get their plans and budgets
7 ready. So I would say for that purpose, we could either
8 pass it or not. People know that's what we want to do.
9 But within the next month or two, unless people are
10 really objecting about this language, it shouldn't take
11 too long.

12 MR. SUTTER: Would it be a resolution that the
13 RAB would vote on and it would be a formal document of
14 the RAB?

15 MR. KERN: I would say so.

16 MR. HULTGREN: Is funding the only reason that
17 this hadn't gone forward previously? Or is it merely
18 the intransigence of Caltrans?

19 MR. KERN: Stepping into potentially in the
20 middle of a -- I mean, it's a perfect question, and I'll
21 try to say what I know. But people are being
22 conservative within the Trust. They don't want to
23 necessarily spend too much money or commit to too many
24 things until that -- it's a chicken and egg kind of a
25 thing. I think if there were more coordinated pressure,

31

1 they would feel more comfortable to move their designs
2 and plans and commitments properly. So it's kind of
3 like everything is kind of bureaucratically sluggish.

4 MR. HULTGREN: That doesn't answer my question.
5 Is funding the only reason it hasn't gone forward? Is
6 state funding the only reason it hasn't gone forward?

7 MR. DIES: No. It's coordination timing-wise.

8 We can't work on Caltrans viaducts and conduits. They
9 have to permit the Trust to work on it regardless of who
10 pays.

11 MR. BOGGS: Caltrans Legal (INAUDIBLE) doesn't
12 believe they were liable.

13 MR. HULTGREN: That's it. It's not the
14 funding. If they believe they were liable, the funding
15 would follow, wouldn't it? So it seems to me, we're
16 talking about apples when we should be working on
17 oranges.

18 MR. DIES: Right of way and funding, I think,
19 are both issues.

20 MR. KERN: This is a first draft.

21 MR. HULTGREN: That's my reaction to it. I
22 haven't been as involved in it recently as I should have
23 been perhaps, but my thought has always been that it's
24 basically Caltrans digging in its heels, which it is
25 customary to do. If they wanted to do it, they either

32

1 have the funding or they get the funding. But they
2 don't want to do it. They will never admit to doing it.
3 And I don't think they're ever going to admit to doing
4 it without some pressure, other than getting funding for
5 them. Perhaps legislation would be an answer, but it
6 would have to be legislation mandating somehow, if
7 that's possible, that Caltrans do this. I don't care if
8 the funding is there. They're not going to do it.

9 MR. COOPER: But all we're asking for is
10 funding. We're not asking them to perform work, at
11 least at this point. I mean, we can decide that later.

12 MR. HULTGREN: But Caltrans isn't going to
13 agree to it.

14 MS. TRIGIANI: They don't even agree that
15 they're responsible, right?

16 MR. HULTGREN: They won't want to use any
17 funding. Let's say they won't go to the legislature.
18 They won't tell the legislature that they agreed to the
19 funding, because they don't agree to their liability.
20 And if they agree to the funding, and it's done, then in
21 the future they have assumed a liability that they don't
22 want to assume. So I don't think funding is the real
23 issue here.

24 MR. COOPER: Wait. You mean, it's the
25 liability case at the same time. I'm not too sure what

33

1 your point is.

2 MR. HULTGREN: As far as I'm aware, the real
3 issue is that Caltrans doesn't want to do this, doesn't
4 want to admit this liability, doesn't want to take any
5 responsibility for it. But they've got to be forced to
6 change it. Funding isn't going to force it.

7 MR. SUTTER: That's the purpose of this
8 process.

9 MR. KERN: It could be -- we're certainly
10 talking about the same thing, that they need to be
11 forced into it, and it could be that the way I've
12 written this doesn't fully capture it. But it would
13 have been a way for other folks to understand kind of
14 what we want. Some of this could be worked out.

15 MR. HULTGREN: This doesn't hurt anything, but
16 I think it's going to be a hollow sort of approach to

17 the problem. Like I say, it doesn't hurt, but I'm just
18 very skeptical about it helping.

19 MR. KERN: I had a couple of hands that I
20 wanted to follow, and then we can decide whether this is
21 a good strategy. Let me catch up to that and then come
22 back.

23 MS. PASSERO: I agree with your point. I don't
24 know if there's more than one liable party. That would
25 be another factor. But then also, have you already

34

1 looked at existing Prop money already? I don't remember
2 the breakdown in the recent proposition for
3 Environmental Prop 50 maybe. I don't know if that's
4 been completely earmarked. So it might be something to
5 explore to see where those existing funds are and if
6 there is anything that would sort of fit this particular
7 situation.

8 MR. COOPER: Do you know which state agency has
9 jurisdiction under Proposition 50?

10 MS. PASSERO: It's multiple. It will be spread
11 out. You can probably do an internet search. There's
12 lots of descriptions on proposition sources of funding.

13 MR. COOPER: The Regional Water Quality --

14 MS. PASSERO: There's several propositions that
15 you might want to check.

16 MR. BUDROE: With regard to Caltrans and
17 funding, the legislature passes bills and the governor
18 signs it, that directs Caltrans to do X, Y, and Z and
19 gives them money. They have got no choice statutorily
20 but to get off their dead butts and do it.

21 MR. HULTGREN: But funding is the least of the
22 concerns here. The main thing is, of course, to ask
23 them to do it.

24 MR. BUDROE: They do not ignore statutory
25 requirements lightly. It's one of these things where --

35

1 MR. HULTGREN: What I'm saying is the language
2 here is inadequate.

3 MR. BUDROE: Well, actually it's not. Because
4 what you're trying to do is to hold a hammer over
5 Caltrans' head that says, "You need to do this. We
6 don't care if you met liability or not." But you need
7 to come to the party. We would like you to put money
8 up, and you need to do what needs to be done to get this
9 rolling. And you can do that by agreement between the
10 appropriate legislators and the Trust and Caltrans and
11 everybody. You can do that through passing a statute
12 law that will give them no wiggle room, and they would
13 have to do it. Of course, you're fighting a veto from
14 the governor. Or you can do it by intermediate steps
15 like, "We've got this bill. We're hanging this over
16 your head. Let's sit down and reason gently together
17 and work out a solution so we don't have to pass this
18 and make an ugly scene."

19 MR. BOGGS: Most likely though, the legal
20 issues that require resolution, prior to it ever being
21 presented to the legislature, it would have to go
22 through administrative law review. And it most likely
23 would not, without the legal requirements at least being
24 discussed, because Caltrans has plenty of people
25 involved in their regs and anything that's going to be

1 involved. And the truth is, it will probably force some
2 resolutions and discussions and action. I would imagine
3 there would be a lot resolved prior to it ever becoming
4 legislation.

5 MR. HULTGREN: Two comments, if I could. One,
6 I don't disagree. But I think the language here should
7 be a lot stiffer. In essence it should say, "If you
8 want Caltrans" -- if you're looking at Caltrans, name
9 them, to compel or to -- it's a bad word -- but to
10 compel them to do whatever it is, and to provide the
11 funding for it.

12 The second comment, though, it seems to me one of
13 the appropriate places to try to nudge them here is
14 through our local Assemblyman and State Senator. I
15 think John Burton should be very supportive of the
16 Presidio. He has a big hammer in Sacramento. Maybe
17 sending something like this directed to him. He
18 certainly should get a copy of it.

19 MR. KERN: It was actually a part of the
20 strategy that we discussed at the committee meeting, so
21 we're entirely in sync on that.

22 MS. TRIGIANI: John, are you saying that you
23 feel that we can circumvent dealing with Caltrans by
24 going straight to legislative means?

25 MR. BUDROE: No. You're going to have to deal

1 with Caltrans. There's a question of liability, but
2 Caltrans regardless of what regs they've got, the

3 legislature can still pass statutes that says, "You'll
4 do this." Regardless of what Caltrans' regs are,
5 they're out of luck.

6 MS. TRIGIANI: That just seems risky to me
7 though, because it seems to me they'll go to Caltrans
8 and they'll be all kinds of brokering and stuff behind
9 the scenes.

10 MR. BUDROE: Well, yeah, but that's where in
11 reality a lot of times this stuff never goes to actually
12 being put into a bill because there is risks that go
13 with that, too. It tends to be more, you've got the
14 threat of this hanging over your head. We can do this
15 the easy way, or we can do this the hard way. Which way
16 do you want to go? And there's downsides associated
17 with Chronicle adds saying how Caltrans is fighting this
18 piece of legislation, and Davis may veto it if he hasn't
19 taken a position, or whoever is governor. There is
20 reverberations on both sides of the fence. It's kind of
21 like if you want to talk to a mule first, then you got
22 to whack it between the eyes with a two-by-four.
23 Caltrans might be kind of in that position. It might
24 take them the threat of legislation hanging over their
25 head to make them do something. One thing is on the

38

1 question of timing, it would probably be optimal if the
2 board would consider adopting whatever resolution -- if
3 it chooses to adopt the resolution -- to do it at the
4 next board meeting, because it's going to take a fair
5 amount of lead time talking to -- if that's the course
6 to be taken -- to talk to who you're going to talk to in
7 the legislature. John Burton obviously comes to mind,

8 to get them educated up to speed and figure out how to
9 proceed. What's the best tactical approach to getting
10 this done, be it a bill, be it negotiations with
11 Caltrans, sitting down and talking to them, however?
12 But I mean, everything -- politician time runs real
13 slow. So if it gets down to a point where everything's
14 got to be chewed over by everybody at long length,
15 you'll liable to miss the train.

16 MS. MONAGHAN: I had two things in my notes
17 from the meeting that we don't have in the resolution.
18 One was that we were talking about connecting the runoff
19 to a city sewer system. So the city should be in here
20 somewhere because we're going to be using some of their
21 facilities.

22 And the other thing that we had was that Tony was
23 talking about the Clean Water Act Two and whether or not
24 Caltrans had to handle the runoff situation
25 appropriately sometime in the future. Maybe this is the

39

1 beginning of that. So I thought maybe that would be
2 worth looking into, too.

3 MR. KERN: I guess with all these items, for
4 those of you that are making the comments, I can use
5 your help in crafting them, particularly Julian with the
6 comment about -- I can say that I didn't actually think
7 about naming Caltrans in here. I didn't for this first
8 draft simply because I figured somebody would say,
9 "Well, let's not name them. It's too harsh," or
10 whatever. So if you could help me with what you'd like
11 to see there that would be -- something to strengthen

12 it -- that would be great.

13 So, so far comments, we've got perhaps some
14 stronger language that would name Caltrans and basically
15 say that we're going try to compel them to join us at
16 the table, some language such as that; perhaps working
17 in the city of San Francisco as being involved, and then
18 the Clean Water Act as another method for getting
19 Caltrans involved in the project. My apologies for not
20 getting that in. That was a great comment.

21 MR. DISTEFANO: Actually, I'd like to speak to
22 that. I believe what I suggested was to look at that
23 route. But if you have that as a separate yet parallel
24 process to what you're doing here -- in other words,
25 that would be another avenue to approach the same goals.

40

1 You can have a multi-pronged effort there. And it ties
2 in a little bit with what Michelle brought up with the
3 Prop 50 monies. There's monies for what Caltrans is
4 directed to do. So maybe if might behoove the RAB to
5 actually keep that ought out of here and just have that
6 as an alternate.

7 MR. KERN: It's something for us definitely as
8 we go on in this process at the next committee meeting,
9 we'll bring more of that material together and hash it
10 around.

11 MR. SUTTER: I'd like to suggest John's caveat,
12 that we look toward getting this resolution adopted at
13 the next RAB meeting.

14 MR. KERN: I can tell you it's a very worthy
15 goal. This is kind of a complex thing that we're going
16 to try to do here. So the more specific we get in the

17 resolution, the less likely we may be able to pass it,
18 because people will bring up counter-issues to specific
19 items. So as you help craft this, keep that in mind.

20 And I would agree. I would like to get something
21 done by the next meeting, but the most specific we get,
22 the more other people can raise counter-strategies and
23 suggestions of why it wouldn't work. And just to kind
24 of lay an over-arching issue on this, what we're trying
25 to transmit is this is an important issue to this group,

41

1 and we're ready to organize throughout the community and
2 say, "Something is going to happen; something really
3 good. We're going to get this thing to work." We need
4 to do it in appropriate timing with our legislators, and
5 as has been discussed, do it in a way that people
6 believe that it's happening, because we're going to
7 really get the legislation in place. Hopefully, we
8 won't use it. All those things. It has to be very
9 credible.

10 MR. SUTTER: I think it would be important in
11 the political process for mobilizing support toward this
12 effort to have the resolution formally adopted by the
13 RAB. That will give it some initial credibility. So
14 that's why I'm making the point of emphasizing we should
15 get the damn thing approved at the next RAB meeting.
16 And whatever fights we have to do, we should do that
17 maybe at the next committee meeting, so we're on the
18 next page by the next RAB meeting.

19 MS. BLUM: I believe Mountain Lake resides in
20 the Richmond District. That's Jake McGoldrick's

21 district, I think. In any event, if we have a RAB
22 member who lives in that district, they would be a
23 really good liaison to take it to City Hall and get the
24 appropriate meeting with the supervisor and the
25 appropriate department meeting where they could come

42

1 to -- maybe they could even hone the language -- but
2 come to an agreement about what everybody's roles would
3 be. And I would definitely take that step to get that
4 help and guidance.

5 MR. SUTTER: I don't think that getting Clean
6 Water (INAUDIBLE) approval will be a problem. It'll be
7 a simple, straightforward community process. I don't
8 know that we need to do that this fall because the work
9 is not going to happen until -- when Craig -- three
10 years from now?

11 MR. COOPER: Oh, yeah, almost seven. I have a
12 couple of comments on this too. It hasn't been delayed
13 yet. Back when Mountain Lake was a no-action site, and
14 it was just a restoration project, from that
15 perspective, when they found the contamination, that
16 restoration schedule has been delayed. But now that
17 it's a remediation site, it's not scheduled until '07 or
18 '06. So it hasn't been delayed. It could be. The
19 remediation and restoration could be delayed if certain
20 things don't come together.

21 MR. KERN: I had a couple more hands.

22 MS. PASSERO: I think it's already understood,
23 but I think there's lots of things in between, as far as
24 going the legislative route, which requires a lot of
25 work. Getting a letter together, mobilizing people,

1 going to visit your representatives, meet with the staff
2 people. They're thinking about what they want to do for
3 legislation right now. October, November. They're
4 already thinking about what they want to pass and
5 introduce in January, February. I would just go and
6 meet with John Burton's staff; explain the issue;
7 explain how many people, how much support you have
8 behind the idea, and then let him talk back to you also.
9 Because they're going to tell you other things, other
10 channels that they will use or employ to get the same
11 results instead of going through -- you could go through
12 the legislature, but you have to think about where the
13 dynamics -- California is broke. That would scare many
14 people for other reasons. So I think doing incremental
15 steps in the interim can be very fruitful and less
16 expensive.

17 MR. COOPER: One quick comment on that. To the
18 extent that agency members or RAB members, you know, we
19 can't meet with elected officials. I think that's
20 considered lobbying. So you guys would be on your own
21 for that stuff.

22 MR. ULLENSVANG: If I can offer one suggestion.
23 You need to have a pretty clear idea of what you're
24 asking for. And I haven't yet heard what you're going
25 to ask for. I think that defining it -- because you're

1 only going to go once. You're not going to be able to
2 ask the question twice if you ask the wrong one the

3 first time. Are you asking for \$1 million, or are you
4 asking for them to do something, or you asking for
5 \$10 million? Those are all very different questions,
6 and you want to get that question phrased right, so that
7 when you get what you asked for, it's what you want.

8 MR. SUTTER: You need a statement of the scope
9 of work.

10 MS. SEGAL: What's the issue then? It's now a
11 remediation site, but Caltrans has never accepted
12 responsibility for taking part in that. But my question
13 was, when I look at the update, it's unclear in here --
14 it talks about Mountain Lake Enhancement Project. So
15 work is going on there now, I guess. I haven't been
16 there in too long. It says, "Planning continues for
17 future phases of the project (INAUDIBLE) remove the
18 hazardous waste from the lake." Well, no one is going
19 to be removing them unless Caltrans does something. Any
20 kind of remediation actually is at a standstill; is that
21 right?

22 MR. COOPER: Again, the remediation is not
23 scheduled until '06/'07.

24 MS. SEGAL: But the responsible party -- the
25 Trust is looking to Caltrans to take on the major

45

1 responsibility. And actually, I'm not sure what City of
2 San Francisco's input into this, or responsibility,
3 would be, if any.

4 MR. BOGGS: They were named at the time of
5 Caltrans because they actually own a little tiny portion
6 of land on the south side of Mountain Lake, a little
7 bend in the property line that extends to Mountain Lake.

8 So only because they're a contiguous property owner that
9 owns a tiny, tiny portion of Mountain Lake, they are,
10 quote, "potentially responsible."

11 MS. SEGAL: Well, I think in answer to Brian's
12 question, and I wasn't at the committee meeting, so I
13 didn't hear the discussion, but basically we're saying,
14 "Caltrans, come to the plate." And even though it may
15 not be on the schedule to 2006 or 2007, they need to
16 come -- I think that's what we're asking for, is
17 pressure to Caltrans to say they're responsible, and
18 they need to work with the Trust and Park Service and
19 the city in resolving the cleanup issues at Mountain
20 Lake.

21 MR. BOGGS: You may want to think about this.
22 Asking them to claim more responsibility, you're going
23 to have a hell of a battle. Because then they're going
24 to be claiming responsibility for every roadway
25 throughout the state that had lead runoff from cars.

46

1 They're going to tell you that all the people driving
2 the cars in the city of San Francisco are liable. So
3 you may not want them to just say, "Yes, we're
4 responsible." You may get better effect by getting them
5 to say, "No. We're not responsible, but we'll help take
6 part in this."

7 MR. KERN: I think what Brian is suggesting, if
8 I could perhaps be more precise -- and I can't put this
9 in yet -- but we may suggesting that we all know --
10 maybe it's not in here -- but we need to know how much
11 money we want them to bring to the table. We need to

12 know what kind of plans -- we need to know how much it's
13 going to cost to dig up this stuff, haul it away, and
14 what we're going to do to the lake and all that part of
15 it very well. So all the appropriate people around the
16 table, everybody we're going to talk to, we can say,
17 "This is how much it's going to be, we think, their
18 share."

19 MS. SEGAL: So you're saying Mountain Lake was
20 never part of the Human Health and Ecological Risk
21 Assessment? Just a no-action kind of thing?

22 MR. COOPER: No. It is a remediation site now.
23 It's in the Feasibility Study. The Presidio Trust
24 Feasibility Study is recommending excavation. There is
25 a very rough cost estimate in the Feasibility Study

47

1 right now for what it's going to cost to clean up
2 Mountain Lake. But we know that's a rough cost
3 estimate. And that's why we're moving forward with the
4 design phase. We've instructed our contractors to go
5 forward, and we're using Army funds right now. We're
6 taking it forward to at least a 30 percent preliminary
7 design so we can, A, so we can figure out -- because
8 it's going to be a complex cleanup. So we need to
9 figure out how we're going to be able to do this. And
10 then we want to present that 30 percent design to the
11 regulators, get their input, because they might have
12 comments to change, "No, don't do it this way. Do your
13 staging over here," etc. All that is necessary before
14 we can revise the cost estimate, the one from the
15 Feasibility Study, and revise that. And so we'll have a
16 much better handle on what we think it's going to cost.

17 That's why we decided to keep moving forward with the
18 design for the cleanup.

19 MR. DIES: I detect a sense from Presidio Trust
20 that Caltrans should pay 100 percent of this or a fair
21 share?

22 MR. COOPER: No. I think we've always said
23 from the beginning a fair share. We haven't put a
24 percentage on it at this point.

25 MR. SUTTER: I think what's critical at this

48

1 point, following up on Brian's comment, is that we have
2 a fairly clear statement of the scope of work that we're
3 looking at here is Caltrans sharing responsibility. And
4 then, I presume we could get that.

5 MR. COOPER: Right. We're working on that.

6 MR. SUTTER: And next to that, whatever cost
7 estimates you come up with at this stage for that share
8 of remediation work and a new location of the drains, if
9 you don't have a specific cost estimate, a ballpark.
10 But I think the scope of work and responsibility is the
11 key thing. Because the costs are going to change over
12 time. Once we get the scope of work and a ballpark cost
13 estimate with the understanding that that cost estimate
14 will be refined through the design process, we will have
15 gotten the commitment that we need.

16 MR. KERN: I'm kind of in a facilitation
17 dilemma here. I know people are beginning to comment on
18 each other's comments. But I also want to make sure
19 that I kind of get people in order. So I want to go to
20 Jim, and then Julian, I think you had something to say.

21 MR. PONTON: I just want to add that the
22 Regional Board wasn't part of the meetings with Caltrans
23 and the Trust and the DTSC, but I did provide Chris
24 Nelson a while back some information on Lake Merced
25 which is an equivalent or a parallel type of water body

49

1 where I think -- and I'm not sure, I don't remember. I
2 believe stormwater is directed to Lake Merced from storm
3 drains potentially. I would have to review all that.
4 And I think there was a plan at one point to aid in the
5 restoration of Lake Merced and bring water levels up by
6 directing water to Lake Merced. So I would say that it
7 might be a benefit to find how Lake Merced is being
8 handled within the city and use that as a corollary.
9 It's a powerful tool to use it that way because it's
10 certainly much larger. It's equivalent. It's
11 threatened. If I recall, I believe they're trying to
12 restore it through introduction of water. But I
13 provided all that to Chris. I can look back on it.

14 The other thing is follow up on Prop 50 grants. We
15 do administer quite a bit of money internally for Prop
16 50 grants (INAUDIBLE) project proponent of their project
17 that's provided (INAUDIBLE) some new projects that are
18 funded. That's something that we do handle, too.

19 MR. HULTGREN: I don't think it would be any
20 business of the RAB to make any kind of a demand or
21 suggestion or proposal for any dollar amount, period.
22 It's just not what we're empowered to do. This is
23 something that is between the Trust negotiators and
24 Caltrans. We have to be very careful that we don't
25 impose ourselves between those two because it is not our

1 job to negotiate with Caltrans. So anything we put into
2 a resolution has to be very careful in that regard.

3 The second thing is, I don't know how we can
4 intelligently draft a resolution that says what we want
5 without having some better idea on what the Trust has
6 done thus far to make demands and to negotiate with
7 Caltrans. Because I don't know. All I know is that
8 we're asked Caltrans to participate, and they have said
9 no for these reasons. I think we need to know more
10 about that issue before we can really come to grips with
11 a resolution.

12 MR. BOGGS: I think the initial efforts came
13 from my agency. We actually drafted a letter to them
14 stating that we believe that they were partially
15 responsible. We asked them to attend a meeting. There
16 was attorneys from the Park Service, Trust, etc. They
17 had a representative -- not one of their attorneys --
18 that came to the meeting. Shortly after the meeting,
19 Caltrans sent -- attorneys sent our letter saying we
20 don't believe that we're responsible. We are not even
21 going to come to any more meetings. That was
22 paraphrased.

23 MR. DIES: Didn't they cite the CERCLA
24 exemption?

25 MR. COOPER: Controlling exemption. They cited

1 it in their letter. That letter is a public letter, if
2 people want to get copies of it.

3 MR. DIES: So they do have a hook.

4 MR. HULTGREN: To that extent, what we can
5 resolve is that we resolve to urge Caltrans to come to
6 the table and discuss with the Trust. That's the stall
7 at this point. Unless we can somehow mandate that
8 through the legislature, and I don't know if we can.
9 You can't mandate them to do something -- I don't think
10 we could ever get it passed -- to do something where
11 they adamantly say, "We are not responsible."

12 MR. BUDROE: With respect to Brian's comment,
13 we do want to have a pretty good general idea of what
14 you want to accomplish before you walk into the
15 legislature. However, you do not have to have every I
16 dotted and every T crossed. You just don't. I may have
17 led people to misunderstand that a fully-unfolded plan
18 would have to be delivered by the end of January,
19 beginning of February. That's not the case.

20 You can wind up -- for example, one of the tactics
21 that people use often in that situation is to get a bill
22 introduced that literally says, "The contents of this
23 bill will be amended later." And all you wind up with
24 is a placeholder. You can be stretching into August
25 before somebody drafts it. Usually it's much before

52

1 then. But basically what you have to do, if it's going
2 to get done, is to go to the legislative people. And
3 the reason I mention John Burton earlier is because he's
4 termed out. This next year coming up is his last year.
5 After that, he's gone. And you lose a big chunk of
6 somebody with the go power to get things done.

7 MR. HULTGREN: There will be somebody from San
Page 44

8 Francisco who is going to be the new John Burton.

9 MR. BUDROE: I guarantee you there will be
10 nobody in that legislature from San Francisco that will
11 have the impact that John Burton will have. So you at
12 least have to make contact with the offices of whoever
13 you're going to talk to soon to get the ball rolling.
14 There are things that the Presidio Trust cannot do, and
15 most assuredly the state regulatory agencies can't do,
16 since they are prohibited by law from lobbying the
17 legislature, that the Presidio Trust and the RAB and the
18 community organizations can facilitate. And that's
19 essentially what this comes down to.

20 You and I may not push, for example, dead on for a
21 bill to be passed. But you might entirely be able to do
22 it by means of negotiation or looking to see what
23 proposition bond money is out there and is available
24 that might be used. But that's one of the tools that
25 you have to leverage the situation. And if you don't

53

1 make contact fairly early, and put yourself at least in
2 the position, whoever is doing this, whatever groups
3 come together to make this happen, of having the
4 potential of having a bill in the hopper, something that
5 can be worked with early in the year when you were
6 giving up one of the tools. But this board and a few
7 organizations can do things that the Presidio just can't
8 do.

9 MR. KERN: This has been a lively discussion
10 extended from our committee meeting. There are a lot of
11 issues that are not necessarily resolved. This is

12 standard for this group to raise a bunch of important
13 things and then begin to distill it and try to resolve
14 some of the issues that have been raised.

15 So we have a lot of options. And I'll certainly be
16 working on it with you between now and the next meeting.
17 I welcome your comments; Phone, E mail, between now and
18 that time. We'll discuss it some more and hopefully
19 come up with some decision about what to do prior to the
20 next meeting, whether we want to proceed or not.

21 Anything else before we take a break? Thanks to
22 all of you for this lively discussion. We'll come back
23 for Item 5C in about ten minutes.

24 (Break taken.)

25 MR. KERN: We're going to fire this thing up

54

1 again.

2 MR. COOPER: I know it has been a long night
3 already, folks. Everyone has my handout here. I'd be
4 more than happy just to say we read it and went home for
5 the night. I'm going to start talking until you tell me
6 to stop. All right.

7 The Feasibility Study. As you know, we sent it out
8 last year. We got a comment letter from the RAB. I owe
9 you guys a letter. I've been on vacation the last
10 couple of weeks. Chris is helping me write it. I hope
11 to put something together to send over to Brian within a
12 week or so.

13 Also on the cost letter, I sent a draft to Brian,
14 and I think he gave an okay to send that out. I'll be
15 sending you a letter very soon on the cost, and three
16 weeks after that on the FS.

17 We're still working at Public Health. That's where
18 Landfills 8 and 10 are on. Our Five Year Review Report
19 unfortunately has just gotten hung up due to some poor
20 quality work by our consultant URS. But we hope to get
21 that out really soon now. That is becoming quite a
22 critical path project for us based on Hilary Gillman's
23 presentation about the future use at the hospital, etc.
24 So we got to get that one going. I'm feeling the heat.
25 Landfill E. The only new thing on that one is that

55

1 the Presidio Trust has hired a new environmental
2 consultant for that project, and that project only. It
3 is CH2MHill. Once all the ink is dry on our contract
4 with CH2MHill, we'll definitely bring them in, introduce
5 them to everybody and have a kick-off meeting on
6 Landfill E, on what's going to happen next, which is the
7 Focus Feasibility Study.

8 Firing ranges. We went out and we implemented the
9 RFS work plan. That's been done. We're validating the
10 data. I'm not too sure why additional sampling may be
11 warranted. I need to talk to Chris about new --

12 MR. BOGGS: A couple of hits, just to
13 Further --

14 MR. COOPER: Oh. For better delineation.

15 MR. DIES: Backing up. On Landfill E, the new
16 engineering firm, is it going to duplicate some things
17 that were already done?

18 MR. COOPER: No. They're taking it to the next
19 step.

20 Mountain Lake. We were just talking about that.

21 We are working on it. As you know, we still have to
 22 write a RAP for Mountain Lake. We're also working on
 23 the design because that's where we can really -- once we
 24 get a preliminary design in front of the regulations, we
 25 can fine-tune our cost estimate, and only after we

56

1 fine-tune our cost estimate does the Trust really want
 2 to give what we think Caltrans' fair share is going to
 3 be.

4 Nike swale. Again, we have to do some better
 5 delineation work on that. That Sample Plan is with the
 6 agencies right now.

7 You heard the whole story about Baker Beach sites,
 8 so nothing new to say there. We had a whole public
 9 meeting about it earlier this evening. So I'm sure you
 10 don't want to hear about it again.

11 There is this other big RAP in the works. I think
 12 I told you about it. We're calling it the Baker Beach
 13 1-2-and-whole-bunch-of-other-sites RAP. I think it has
 14 25 sites in it. It's going to be a huge undertaking
 15 from not only writing the RAP but writing the proposed
 16 plan for that RAP, writing the CEQA documents for that
 17 RAP. It's going to be quite an interesting experience.
 18 So stay tuned for that. That will be a big venture for
 19 us next year.

20 1065, as you know, is one of our petroleum
 21 projects. As you know, we're doing an interim action.
 22 We've started the bidding process to procure a
 23 contractor to implement our Interim Action Plan. Ryan
 24 Seelback, the Trust Project Manager on that, is telling
 25 me he hopes to start work by next month. A couple of

1 other miscellaneous things going on in the 1065 study
2 area with respect to some groundwater sampling, and so
3 on. Again, after the Interim Action Plan, we still have
4 to write the Corrective Action Plan or 1065 Cap to
5 finish up whatever work needs to be done at that
6 petroleum site.

7 207-231 is still in the data gap fill-in stage.
8 That work plan is with the agency. And Commissary PX
9 Corrective Action Plan site. That one is moving along.
10 We collected all the data gaps information already.
11 We've sent that information to the regulators on August
12 12th. And so now we've instructed our contractor to
13 take the next step and start preparing a Draft
14 Corrective Action Plan. So that one is moving along.

15 This is big news. We've talked about this before
16 with Jim. Jim has done a couple of presentations on the
17 new Regional Board Order that basically, as you know,
18 kind of collapses the two old orders that were sent to
19 the Army into a new and revised and updated order. It
20 was adopted on August 20. Immediately after, I went on
21 vacation, but I had looked at it before, and there is
22 some things coming up pretty soon that the Trust needs
23 to do to comply with this order. For example, we need
24 to put together a specific schedule, all of our
25 petroleum sites, and send that over to Jim. That will

1 be fairly easy for us to do. As you know, we have a
2 master remediation schedule already. We'll pull the

3 petroleum sites out, take a look at our schedule for the
4 petroleum sites and make sure and maybe tweak that a
5 little bit and send that over to Jim as one of our first
6 submittals under the new order.

7 The third bullet on this is there's a couple of
8 clean up levels for petroleum constituents that we still
9 need to work out. They're actually eco-based cleanup
10 levels for diesel and fuel oil. So stay tuned on that.
11 We're putting a work plan on that because that's
12 required in the new order. It was required in the old
13 order, too. Groundwater monitoring reporting will now
14 be semi annual, just as Jim talked about before. So
15 there you have it.

16 Groundwater monitoring. Same old story. We're
17 moving along. We're still monitoring on a quarterly
18 basis, but we'll be reporting on a semi annual basis.
19 There you have it. We'll put our Q1 and Q2 data into
20 the first semi annual report for 2003.

21 MR. KERN: Just a quick question on that. It's
22 usually in about another -- a quarter is three months --
23 so it's been about a three-month period after the
24 sampling to get the report. Is that still going to be
25 about the same amount of time?

59

1 MR. ULLENSVANG: The quarter has specific dates
2 that the reports are due. So the first and second
3 quarter report is due October 15th. April 15 for three
4 and four. So it actually speeds up the second quarter.

5 MR. COOPER: Mustard agent sites. We all know
6 where that is. You know, there's two things going on.
7 There's that stockpiled soil that the Army needs to take

8 care of. They put together a Draft Work Plan. The
9 Trust and DTSC has now commented on that. The Army is
10 preparing a response to those comments.

11 The second thing that they're doing is this
12 Presidio-wide archive search report about weapons use
13 and potential combat training zones. The Army is now
14 saying it's coming out in October. And Bruce Handell
15 from the Army would like to come to the RAB for the
16 October RAB meeting and give the RAB an update on both
17 of those projects -- the soil, the stockpiled soil, the
18 screening process, and their overall Presidio-wide
19 archive search report, and what next steps might happen
20 on that. So I'm assuming you guys would want to comment
21 in October.

22 A couple of new documents came out. We all know
23 about the RAP and the revised 1065 Interim Action Plan.
24 That's it. Thank you.

25 MR. KERN: Any questions? We are on Item

60

1 No. 6. I'll go to Bob.

2 MR. BOGGS: Nothing to add unless there is some
3 questions. Seeing none.

4 MR. KERN: All right. Well, our regulatory
5 agencies have commented thoroughly tonight on other
6 subjects. Any new business?

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: I just had a question. When
8 does the fiscal year start for the agency? When will
9 you know if you have layoffs or stuff like that?

10 MR. PONTON: Our fiscal year started July 1.
11 As part of the budget, I think there was a 10 percent

12 reduction in staff assigned to that budget. On June 16,
13 20 percent of the staff at all job categories were sent
14 surplus notices for their job status. The idea was that
15 on September 16th that gives people a 120-day window.
16 On September 16, the layoff notices are supposed to go
17 out with layoffs.

18 As I understand, the unions may negotiate an
19 additional five percent cut in our pay, one day a month
20 off translated to one day or maybe two days off a month
21 without pay, and some other options to retain staff. So
22 that's kind of the status now. So next week on Tuesday,
23 that's the anticipated layoff date for people to get
24 their actual notices in the mail. All the agencies are
25 a little bit different, but I think everyone is

61

1 targeting a ten percent reduction in some way.

2 What we've done is we've eliminated all contracts.
3 Our lab contract; we can't sample water bodies, for
4 example. We send them to a lab. We've eliminated all
5 of our students. We've eliminated the transponders that
6 are in the car for paying tolls. We've eliminated
7 everything that we can to save money -- no training,
8 hiring freeze for the last year and a half. As people
9 leave, we eliminate their positions.

10 MR. BOGGS: Our agency is very, very similar.
11 They sent out surplus notices to 20 percent of the
12 people because potential bumping and seniority and that
13 kind of stuff. It's since been revised and they're
14 projecting now a 10 percent cut at our agency as well.
15 They were hoping to have sent notices out September 1st
16 with a 45-day notice, but now we're on the same schedule

17 as the Water Board. And September 15th we anticipate
18 giving notices, and it's, like you said, for about
19 10 percent across the board in various positions.

20 MR. BUDROE: That's stay tuned, because they've
21 just (INAUDIBLE) at a 20-percent budget drill.

22 MR. BOGGS: There's lots of things in the works
23 as far as -- there's rumors that they may postpone the
24 layoff until after the recall vote.

25 MR. PONTON: The idea was to reduce the state

62

1 payroll by a billion dollars through the elimination of
2 16 thousand positions. The prison system would not be
3 affected. The CHP would not be affected. I think
4 Caltrans is okay too. So, we'll see. I think people in
5 my agency -- back in the Wilson administration they
6 accepted a reduction in pay to preserve staff, their
7 peers. And I think everyone that I work with would also
8 do the same to preserve their friends, to keep their
9 coworkers there. Because there's a lot of work to do,
10 and it's really difficult to keep up with it. It's a
11 pretty busy place. People think of government employees
12 as being slow and stuff, but I think it's a pretty busy
13 place. We'll see.

14 MR. KERN: Any other questions on any new
15 business? Action items. If you're interested, please
16 review the changes to the Bylaws. We will talk about it
17 in the committee meeting and hopefully get those
18 resolved by the next RAB meeting.

19 We have Mountain Lake. It's become a serious
20 agenda item. Look at the resolution. Those of you that

21 have made comments, if you would propose language or
22 bring your discussion points to the committee meeting,
23 we'll get those worked on.

24 Comments for the Fill Site 6A Baker Beach 3 and 4,
25 the RAB could produce a comment letter. It would have

63

1 been a good thing, I guess, for me to have thought about
2 having that here tonight so that we could vote on it or
3 send it along. But another thing to do would be to send
4 along your individual comment letter, which could
5 actually be more effective. If you're supportive of the
6 remedies, or whatever your comment might be, this would
7 be the time to submit that. I would encourage you to do
8 that. I certainly intend to -- even though I made a
9 comment at the meeting tonight -- intend to write up a
10 comment letter in support of the remedies. And it's an
11 important part of the record. And so I would encourage
12 you to do it.

13 MR. COOPER: I would second that emotion. And
14 you can E-mail it. You don't have to find a stamp and
15 an envelope or anything like that. You have Bob's
16 E-mail and my E-mail address. Just an E-mail. Very
17 simple.

18 MR. KERN: Very good. Any other action items
19 that I may have missed?

20 MR. SUTTER: A couple of items. The letters
21 that we so lovingly sent to Craig a month or more ago,
22 comments on the Feasibility Study, and the cause for
23 supporting the recommendation study. We were scheduled
24 to get formal responses at some point from Mr. Cooper.
25 I just don't recall when.

1 MR. KERN: He kind of mentioned that at the
2 beginning of his report.

3 MR. COOPER: The one on cost reporting, I think
4 I'll be able to mail out tomorrow. And just as a brief
5 update on that, it doesn't go into a lot of detail.
6 We're hiring. It's in procurement right now to hire
7 someone, and hopefully it doesn't get snagged by
8 Building 34 folks by getting nervous about hiring a
9 private person to help us with cost tracking. I think
10 we mentioned something about procuring an outside party,
11 or trying to. That letter should be sent out tomorrow.

12 MR. KERN: And then the Feasibility Study
13 letter, he mentioned he submitted it. He needs a little
14 bit more time. He's working on it.

15 MR. SUTTER: I'm sorry. I missed that one.

16 MR. COOPER: Three more weeks on that one.
17 Hopefully by the October RAB meeting, that one should be
18 done.

19 MR. KERN: Did you have --

20 MR. SUTTER: An item perhaps for the next
21 meeting.

22 MS. BLUM: My question was concerning reporting
23 on the budget, and if possible, I would like to add that
24 as a permanent part of the agenda that we have -- even
25 if there's anything to discuss on the budget -- that we

1 have it on a permanent agenda basis. Like where are we?
2 How's the hiring coming? When is the report coming out?

3 That kind of thing.

4 MR. KERN: Anything else?

5 MR. ANDERSON: The FOI business, the insurance.

6 MR. KERN: I guess we're expecting something
7 from the committee, some sort of a recommendation. So
8 at the committee meeting, perhaps? Okay. So I'll put
9 that down. Committee meeting.

10 MR. SUTTER: Craig mentioned the magic word a
11 moment ago. Would it be appropriate in the near future
12 to request a schedule report, a master schedule?

13 MR. KERN: We do get that.

14 MR. COOPER: We do quarterly updates on that.

15 MR. KERN: I think it could really be Mark and
16 I distributing it.

17 MR. COOPER: I'll be doing another update that
18 I have to send Bob by October 1st. If you get the whole
19 schedule, it's 2,000 lines.

20 MR. SUTTER: I don't want the whole activity
21 listings or anything like that. You initially, if I
22 recall, came up with a master schedule and introduced a
23 12-page bar chart. If that's the way that you still do
24 that on a regular basis, I'd just like to request that
25 there be a presentation of that at some other meeting in

66

1 the next couple of months or so.

2 MR. COOPER: By the October one, we could do
3 that. We have that bar chart that shows construction
4 starts, planned construction starts for all the major
5 projects; CERCLA ones and petroleum ones. It actually
6 all fits on one page. Let's hand that one out at the
7 October meeting.

8 MR. SUTTER: So it's the master schedule?
9 MR. COOPER: It's right off the master
10 schedule, but it just shows construction starts for the
11 major projects. It's probably one of the most important
12 ones.
13 MR. KERN: So we'll try to get that on the
14 October meeting.
15 Anything else? So we've been actually capturing 8
16 and 9. Are there any other comments for the good of the
17 order this evening? Seeing none, thank you very much
18 for your participation tonight, coming out. Meeting
19 adjourned.

20 ---o0o---

21
22
23
24
25

†

67

1 RAB MEMBERS
2 Jerry Anderson
3 Jan Blum
4 Bob Boggs, DTSC
5 John Budroe
6 Craig Cooper
7 George Dies
8 Tony DiStefano
9 Gloria Gee
10 Doug Kern
11 Joel Hermann

12 Julian Hultgren
13 Jack Luikart
14 Jan Monaghan
15 Chris Nelson
16 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
17 Sara Segal
18 David Sutter
19 Mary Trigliani
20 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
21 Tracy Wright
22 Gloria Yaros
23 Mark Youngkin
24 Others present: Terri Thomas
25 Michelle Passero

♀

68

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2
3 I, JUDITH L. LARRABEE, a Hearing Shorthand Reporter
4 in the State of California, duly authorized to
5 administer oaths, hereby certify:

6
7 That I am a disinterested person herein; that
8 the foregoing meeting was reported by me in shorthand,
9 and thereafter transcribed by means of computer-aided
10 transcription.

11
12 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
13 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, nor in
14 any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

15
16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have thereunto set my hand on
Page 58

17 thi s 19th day of September, 2003.

18

19

20

21

Judi th L. Larrabee, Shorthand Reporter

22

23

24

25

⌘

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

OCTOBER 14, 2003
7:00 p.m.
---oOo---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING
2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201
BERKELEY, CA 94704
510 486-0700

meeting to discuss the insurance policy, an ongoing discussion about what to do with the insurance policy. We had a discussion about that, and we basically decided to keep working on it as to come up with a draft (INAUDIBLE), right?

MR. KERN: Draft a letter.

MR. YOUNG: Draft a letter, or something along those lines. Anyway, we decided to keep pursuing that issue.

We came up with agenda items for the next meeting. So our next Planning Committee meeting is on October 28th. Thank you.

MR. KERN: Any questions for Mark?

We'll move to our Membership Committee Chair, Jan Monaghan.

MS. MONAGHAN: I have two new members to present to the RAB tonight. Karen Cleek and Michelle Passero. Karen is sitting down here at the end. She lives in San Francisco, and she's involved with the Park Presidio neighbors, and right now she's working on a Greenway cleanup project. She's a CPA.

Now, Michelle Passero lives in Mill Valley, so that helps us with our geographic diversity. She's an attorney that works as a policy director for the Pacific Forest Trust. I'd like to recommend them to the RAB for

PROCEEDINGS

MR. KERN: We welcome everyone to the regularly scheduled meeting for the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board for October 2003. I'd like to welcome the Presidio Trust and their contractors tonight; the National Park Service, the members here, our regulatory community, RAB community members, and any members in the audience that are here tonight from the general public, and the Park Service and the Trust. Welcome tonight and thanks for being with us.

Are there any changes or additions to tonight's agenda? All right. Any announcements or old business?

Let's move on, then, to Item 4A, Planning Committee Report. Mark.

MR. YOUNGKIN: Okay. The RAB Planning Committee met on September 23rd, at 7:00 o'clock, at the usual place. We had a good turnout this month. We spent most of the meeting discussing the Mountain Lake resolution, which is coming up later tonight. We had a long discussion on that. It's a pretty interesting topic to discuss, too. Lots of different opinions.

We also discussed the bylaws, which is coming up tonight, too. We went over some of the bylaw revisions that have been occurring.

Also, community members met at the end of the

membership.

MR. KERN: Okay. I would like to, perhaps, hear a motion to that.

MR. LUIKART: Move.

MR. KERN: Second?

MS. BLUM: Second.

MR. KERN: It's been moved and seconded that we accept the two new RAB members to our board. All in favor?

??? : Aye.

MR. KERN: Opposed? Very good. Motion carries. Very much welcome to the board and thank you for coming to the meetings that you've been to and going through the process.

I think we say this generally, but if there are any issues along the way that, say, you have questions, please ask any of us at any time via E-mail, phone, after meetings. There are a variety of sort of orientation things we do; tours around the Presidio, so we'd be happy to get those, you know --

MS. MONAGHAN: Craig is working on that already.

MR. KERN: Oh, great.

MR. COOPER: So we owe a tour for Michelle and Karen. During the break or something like that, I'll

1 talk to you two and check -- hopefully you've got your
2 calendars with you -- and we can work out a date that
3 works out for us.

4 MR. LUIKART: If you could advertise that date
5 for anyone else that wants to participate.

6 MR. COOPER: Okay.

7 MR. KERN: Thank you, and welcome.

8 Item 4C, Rules Committee, discussion and vote on
9 the RAB Charter and Bylaws. Did everybody pick up a
10 copy of the latest version of the Charter and Bylaws?

11 MR. YOUNGKIN: They were on the table as you
12 came in the door. This is the latest version. Two
13 weeks ago I sent out, by E-mail, a newer version to this
14 for your review. There's only been one change. I only
15 got one comment back in the last two weeks, and that was
16 from Craig Cooper.

17 There was a section on meetings that said that we
18 would try to have the agendas out three calendar days
19 before the meeting. Craig asked if that could be
20 changed to working days to give him a couple more days
21 there. So instead of the notice -- the agenda going out
22 on Saturday, it would go out on Thursday. So that
23 sounded reasonable to me. So I've made those changes.
24 That's all that's changed in the last two weeks.

25 The changes and revisions are basically cosmetic.

1 There's been no sections deleted, no new sections have
2 been added, no procedures have really changed. It's
3 basically just looking for things that are out of date
4 or obsolete or things that didn't work out the way that
5 we thought they would three years ago.

6 Are there any questions on the changes in the
7 revised Charter and Bylaws?

8 MR. LUIKART: I was going to say, who do we
9 thank for this great effort?

10 MR. YOUNGKIN: Julian did a lot of the wording.
11 I kind of outlined areas that I thought were out of
12 date, and Julian did the wording on that. Then I added
13 a few kind of little changes after that.

14 Thanks, Julian, for your input on that.

15 MR. KERN: We have a motion from David to adopt
16 the new bylaws.

17 MR. LUIKART: Second.

18 MR. BERMAN: I have just a discussion point,
19 and that is, not necessarily in this document -- it's
20 not required, but it would be nice if, in fact, the
21 specific law that created the RAB and specified what the
22 RAB is supposed to be could be mentioned somewhere.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Actually, it is mentioned.

24 MR. BERMAN: If it's not too long, maybe it
25 could be included as an appendix at the end.

1 MR. YOUNGKIN: In the charter on Page 2, we
2 listed the -- 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 -- 7 different laws,
3 guidelines, presidential directives that basically
4 created the whole RAB process.

5 MR. BERMAN: Well, they're all mentioned,
6 though. Isn't there just one specific -- I thought --

7 MR. YOUNGKIN: The presidential directive
8 created the RAB; that would be the Presidential
9 July 2nd, 1935 Byar Program.

10 MR. BERMAN: I remember reading it, and it's
11 fairly short and specific as to what it says. And I
12 didn't know whether it's something that would be good to
13 be included in the bylaws or as an appendix or --
14 because, I mean this is kind of -- defines the
15 organization completely in the sense there's a certain
16 completeness if that short section could be appended and
17 easily found.

18 I mean, you know, it's in the Library of Congress
19 files, which you can get if you want to play around for
20 two hours.

21 MR. KERN: Any further discussion? It's been
22 moved and seconded that we adopt this revised, amended
23 and restated Charter and Bylaws. All in favor?
24 Opposed? I think it would be good for the record if we
25 just do a count of the number of votes. So I'll start

1 with Jack. Fifteen to zero to adopt this, on
2 October 14.

3 MR. COOPER: I just noticed that there's -- the
4 very back pages of the Trust -- of your bylaws was some
5 Presidio Trust kind of planning documents. So could you
6 please pull off the last couple of pages?

7 MS. BLUM: Confidential?

8 MR. COOPER: It's not confidential.

9 MR. KERN: We voted this (INAUDIBLE)

10 MR. COOPER: First, for a moment of
11 clarification, I did not do the photocopying, nor did
12 anyone in Building 1750.

13 MR. KERN: We are now to establish plans,
14 policies, and processes -- a whole bunch of things
15 here -- obtaining permits.

16 MR. LUIKART: So it's through Page 17; is that
17 correct?

18 MR. COOPER: Yeah, where it says 17 of 17. All
19 of the pages after that, if you could just rip them off.

20 MR. KERN: We actually voted on these.

21 MR. COOPER: Oh, my God.

22 MR. YOUNGKIN: Actually, it says "end of
23 charter and bylaws," on Page 17, Line 34.

24 MR. KERN: I don't know.

25 MR. COOPER: I wasn't able to print to my

1 computer, so I sent it to someone at Building 34, and
2 she printed it and made all the copies for me, but she
3 obviously had printed something else before and picked
4 things up off the printer and sent them through the copy
5 machine. Yeah.

6 MR. LUIKART: Do we have to return these to you
7 without looking at them?

8 MR. COOPER: You know, if you want to look at
9 them, you can. I would really appreciate if I got them
10 back. I'll tell you what it's about. There's a law
11 called GIFRA -- government accounting something, and we
12 have to -- every government agency has to do a strategic
13 plan.

14 MR. KERN: Again, thanks to Mark and Julian and
15 people who commented on this, updated it. And now as
16 a -- I suppose an additional formality, Mark and Craig
17 will sign and date this for the official copy for the
18 admin record.

19 MR. COOPER: Yes. I'm ready to sign.

20 MR. KERN: Moving on. Item 5A. Mustard Agent
21 Site Update with Bruce Handel from the Army Corps of
22 Engineers. Welcome back, Bruce.

23 MR. HANDEL: Thank you. Randy Curtis will give
24 most of the discussion, but I'd like to introduce a
25 little bit of history, where we were and where we are

1 plan prepared, and last week we sifted through all the
2 piles, and there were no vials found.

3 We turned that material back over to the Trust. I
4 believe they're probably disposing of it or recycling
5 it.

6 MR. COOPER: We took it to a landfill.

7 MR. HANDEL: So that's the first part of our
8 activities at the site. In addition to asking us if we
9 would (INAUDIBLE) the re-piles, we were asked to put
10 together an Archive Search Report. An Archive Search
11 Report is where we go through various records around the
12 country as well as here at the Presidio and look for
13 information about chemical weapons or ordinance as it
14 applied to the Presidio of San Francisco. That kicked
15 off -- when did we start that actual work, in May, I
16 think?

17 MR. CURTIS: January.

18 MR. HANDEL: January. Okay. I have a final
19 Archive Search Report in my office. I'll be
20 distributing that when I return to my office tomorrow.
21 But it will probably go to Craig. He should receive it
22 by Thursday or Friday.

23 Let's see. Okay. The Archive Search Report is
24 really a presentation of the findings from Randy and his
25 team's research. I am forwarding that document to our

1 now. I'm not sure -- most of you probably remember
2 about the Inspiration Point site where mustard vials
3 were found in October of 2002. I came and did a short
4 presentation, I'm going to say, in January or February,
5 if my memory serves me.

6 After we found the vials, the Trust as well as DTSC
7 had some concerns with some material that had been
8 scraped up there as a part of the Park or Trust
9 restoration activities they were doing there for, I
10 guess, natural resource restoration.

11 There was some concern that there may still be some
12 vials in the re-piles, so we were asked if we would
13 search through them and make sure that there were no
14 more vials in them. So we went through the process
15 that -- it included a Probability Assessment that was
16 prepared by our Huntsville Office center of Expertise
17 for Ordinance and Explosives, and that was an assessment
18 done to determine if we could look at this material
19 without going through a formal process by which it's
20 considered a chemical weapons site.

21 The Probability Assessment allowed us to go forward
22 as though it was a normal contaminant site. So they
23 determined that it was improbable that we would find
24 additional vials. So that allowed us to proceed on a
25 simple path. Contracted that out. There was a work

1 Huntsville office, their Center of Expertise again, for
2 chemical weapons materials as well as ordinance
3 explosives. I'm asking them to evaluate the report and
4 provide our district, myself, with recommendations that
5 I can bring forward to the Department of Toxic
6 Substances Control, the Park Service and the Presidio
7 Trust so we can move forward to determine if we need to
8 do additional work, whether it be some site
9 investigation, perhaps an educational program or
10 whatever comes out that we agree upon.

11 Randy Curtis is from our St. Louis office, Army
12 Corp of Engineers. He's going to present the
13 information. He really spearheaded the whole archive
14 search report, and I'll let him provide you with all of
15 the information.

16 I want to note to you that the research results at
17 times are not always complete. There will be pieces of
18 information. Something may be conclusive. Sometimes
19 they're not very conclusive. So keep that in mind.

20 Also, there will be quite a lot of information
21 being presented tonight. You'll probably have a lot of
22 questions and, if at all possible, save your questions
23 'til the end. Otherwise we may not get through this
24 until 11:00 or 12:00 o'clock.

25 Again, it's a lot of information. Please hold your

1 question 'til the end. You can jot them down. If you
2 absolutely have to ask a question, please raise your
3 hand and Randy will honor that. Randy Curtis.

4 MR. CURTIS: Thank you. I have handouts for
5 the slides. I'll pass it around. There's 32 slides.
6 So if we try to spend two minutes on each one then we'll
7 be done in an hour. Hopefully that will work out.

8 There will be a lot of acronyms, and I apologize
9 for that. Craig pointed out that government employees
10 have a tendency. So I'm going to kind of review some of
11 the first ones.

12 Ordinance and Explosives. We're talking bullets,
13 projectiles. This would also be any kind of items like
14 a smoke grenade or hand grenade, et cetera. That all
15 falls into that category.

16 Chemical warfare materials is specifically by
17 International Treaty. It refers to toxic agents,
18 typically mustard agent for our perspective here. It
19 also includes nerve agents. That's not going to really
20 apply to the Presidio. I'll get to that in more detail.

21 I'm going to use the term ASR interchangeably with
22 Archive Search Report. These are a series of reports
23 that are done typically for OE and CWM projects across
24 the country.

25 MR. COOPER: I'd like to do just a brief

1 same format and the same way each time.

2 Then I will briefly go over the summary of
3 information we found about OE activities, which are
4 typical shooting activities, ranges, and then
5 specifically about chemical warfare activities. I'm
6 going to probably confuse you all with the terms,
7 chemical warfare activities versus chemical warfare
8 materials.

9 Chemical warfare activities are activities that
10 were administered by the Chemical Warfare Service.
11 These are the guys that were developed in World War I,
12 and they were responsible for not just -- they were
13 responsible for smoke, tear gas, and anything that was
14 quote, unquote, a chemical, including the things that we
15 typically think of, based on news, like the bad, nasty
16 stuff you spray on people to kill and maim them.

17 But the activities all fall under -- because the
18 training is all being administered by the Chemical
19 Warfare Service dependent, it's easiest to talk about it
20 together, although it does lead to some other confusion.

21 We'll also talk a little bit about map and photo
22 interpretation. A lot of this work was based on textual
23 documents, but also a lot of it was done on aerial
24 photos -- I mean on maps, and those have been very
25 helpful. Then, we also were able to find a lot of

1 introduction also. Just for the RAB members, lots of
2 times when the Presidio Trust does a presentation or
3 something, it's oftentimes been bedded obviously through
4 myself and through Brian, and oftentimes Bob and Jim
5 have seen this. In this particular case, this is purely
6 an Army project, and Bruce had hired the St. Louis
7 Division of Corps of Engineers to do this.

8 I just saw this presentation this afternoon for
9 the first time myself. So this is not -- this is all
10 very new information, and I'm just looking at it myself
11 for the first time, too. So I might have questions. So
12 don't be surprised if I have questions.

13 MR. CURTIS: Okay. So I'll kind of go back and
14 explain how we got here. Kind of pretty much like
15 Mr. Cooper did, and introduce myself again. Go through
16 and explain what the purpose and what the limitations
17 were for the ASR. Explain how we came about. What our
18 process for doing it was. Some of the things we did
19 very heavily, and some of the things we didn't do quite
20 so heavily. Then I'll go over the contents of the
21 report.

22 The ASR is a standardized format, so there's
23 chapter headings that are standardized across them,
24 which probably will not mean anything to anybody in this
25 room, but the people in Huntsville like to see it in the

1 historic aerial photos to help fill in the gaps where
2 textural documents and maps didn't give us all the
3 answers we were looking for.

4 Then we'll give you kind of a summation of what we
5 think we know versus what we kind of know and what we
6 don't really know.

7 MR. COOPER: So is everyone okay with the
8 acronyms? I made an acronym cheat sheet, but I made a
9 mistake on one, so I don't want to hand it out.

10 MR. CURTIS: These are the four bottles they
11 found last year. This was the one that they were
12 working on. I'm guessing it was being cleaned, and in
13 the process somebody suffered some slight burns. They
14 come from a specific type of chemical kit. I'm going to
15 explain those more in detail.

16 As you know, the Technical Escort Unit, and this is
17 the element of the Army that babysits chemical warfare
18 materials. So when they move stuff anymore, it's pretty
19 much like at the end of World War II. These are the
20 guys that move it. They accompany it. And when they
21 find something somewhere, they're the ones that go out
22 and get it. They are the active Army element that take
23 care of the bad stuff.

24 These bottles that were found were part of what we
25 call the "toxic gas set." You could see this bottle is

1 the same as the other -- earlier slide. They put I
2 think six of them -- you see these little cartons -- the
3 little cartons into this metal container with the nice,
4 heavy-duty flange on it. We call it a "pig." These
5 things had mustard agent in 3-ounce bottles, and their
6 primary purpose was to be used in decontamination
7 exercises.

8 A lot of the chemical warfare training is -- it's
9 main purpose is to give confidence to the troops, that
10 if they've reached an area that is contaminated with an
11 agent, that they can decontaminate it and feel
12 comfortable getting through and decontaminating
13 themselves. So to do that, they would use live agents
14 to contaminate themselves or contaminate an area to
15 practice decontaminating, and that's what these things
16 are from.

17 So that's kind of the background for why this all
18 started. This is, I guess, some of the information we
19 knew last year.

20 So how the Corps of Engineers gets involved is --
21 Bruce is from the Sacramento District. There's like
22 30-some-odd elements of the Corps. The group in
23 Huntsville are the Center of Expertise for Ordinance and
24 Explosives. So they are the ones that when the Corps
25 needs expertise within elements of the Sacramento --

1 like the Sacramento District would need expertise, they
2 would typically go to Huntsville.

3 My office in St. Louis has been working for
4 Huntsville, since October '92, writing reports in
5 support of this effort for being the Center of
6 Expertise.

7 Typically, like if you were sampling for a toxic
8 waste, you could sample and get an idea if you have a
9 problem. Well, that's not readily, easily done with
10 ordinance and explosives or chemical warfare materials,
11 because you might be in the middle of a mortar range and
12 if you're not sampling exactly where it is, you might
13 miss what it is.

14 It's exceptionally expensive. So they developed
15 the system of doing this extended research effort to
16 help identify areas of where to look.

17 This is done in both on bug sites, which would be
18 military installations before 1986, that had been
19 released. A lot of World War II properties. So like
20 all the Marin Headlands across the way, and a lot of the
21 other sites have fallen into the postcategory brackets.
22 The Presidio -- not brackets, installations.

23 I've done about 120 of these reports. I have a
24 multi-disciplined team. A lot of the research is done
25 by historians. These two groups of folks here, the EOD,

1 Explosives Ordinance Disposal, or the bomb techs in the
2 Army, a lot of them become bomb squad guys for the
3 civilian police forces.

4 The big key point is: These people are the
5 ammunition nerve to the Army. When you have an
6 ammunition question, these are the types of folks that
7 identify and determine whether -- who shot them. These
8 are the folks that deal with it when it becomes like a
9 (INAUDIBLE) round and needs to be disposed of later on.

10 We also have cartographers and CAD folks that help
11 create some of the elements, support elements of
12 designing what we see afterwards.

13 The purpose and the scope was to see if we could
14 identify just those areas on the Presidio itself that
15 had been used or might have a potential for OE and CWM.
16 To save effort, we excluded all the seacoast batteries,
17 these gun emplacements like Battery Crosby, Battery
18 Godfrey, and all the other ones. They're all fairly
19 well documented. We know where they're at.

20 There have been reports and investigations sampling
21 those for explosive hazards, you know, where they did
22 wipe samples and said, "Yea, verily, there's not an
23 explosive hazard." So it didn't seem like there was
24 much reason to go ahead and do that again. The same
25 thing with AA, which is antiaircraft defense batteries.

1 We were trying to determine what, where, and how
2 much of these other activities, as best we could.

3 Now, as alluded to earlier, what we're finding is
4 pieces of a very large puzzle. We don't have all the
5 pieces. We never do find all the pieces. But we try
6 to -- with the pieces we get, try to make as much of an
7 image as we can.

8 It's not an intrusive. It's not like we sample for
9 any of this. This is all based on historical
10 information.

11 How we went about it is, the National Park Service
12 has done some very, very good histories. Most of these
13 are available online. I'm assuming that everybody here
14 is fairly familiar with the histories.

15 Irwin Thompson, who's passed away, did very good
16 work. His book is available online. We looked at that
17 and looked at what they did.

18 We looked at previous reports that had been done by
19 the Corps and other elements in relationship to this.
20 Most of them were not for OE and chemical warfare
21 materials.

22 Then we had to say, "Okay, this is what's been
23 done. Let's see where we need to go," and then we kind
24 of started focusing on things.

25 The primary reason the collection was there was not

1 for Presidio records, like State libraries, et cetera.
 2 We kind of skipped those. Frequently they don't have a
 3 lot of information, and there were other people that
 4 already had gone through that fairly heavily.

5 We went through the park archives very heavily,
 6 working with the archivists and the historians who have
 7 been there, explaining what we were doing, what are
 8 goals were, figuring out what they knew. Because a lot
 9 of them have done extensive amounts of research.

10 The Park Service has historians on staff that are
 11 exceptionally knowledgeable about the Presidio. So I
 12 talked to them. Actually, I've talked to a lot of them
 13 previously on other projects in the Greater Bay area.
 14 So they were very helpful.

15 We kind of gave very short shift to some things.
 16 We didn't pay any attention to the Spanish-American
 17 history, and the early Army records we didn't give a lot
 18 of emphasis to either. Primary source materials
 19 basically from the 1890s onward.

20 These were the repositories where we contacted or
 21 spent a fair amount of time. Some of the National
 22 Archives, downtown D.C. and then College Park, are two
 23 of probably the largest.

24 I think in our report it's like 50 or 60 pages of
 25 explaining where we went to and what boxes we looked at,

1 so that if somebody says, "Well, did you look at such
 2 and such a bit of information," we can pretty much
 3 determine, yea, verily, we did look at that or no, no,
 4 we didn't look at that box. It's very helpful in case
 5 somebody ever -- I mean, as we've gone back and looked
 6 at what other people have done, it's very helpful to
 7 know, well, did you look here?

8 I guess to give you a scope of just the level of
 9 information in this, I'd like to talk about the Records
 10 Center in D.C. It's literally two floors with rows
 11 going down the middle of it, with rooms 20 feet high,
 12 the size of football fields, with boxes in them for all
 13 sorts of government agencies.

14 The scene from the "Raiders of the Lost Ark" where
 15 they put the ark away and the government doesn't -- it
 16 kind of forgets about it, it's not such -- the records
 17 system in the government is just huge, and it's not --
 18 it's fairly well thought out, but it doesn't always work
 19 as well as you might expect.

20 Like the Personnel Records Center, if any of you
 21 guys have had a military record or were in the military,
 22 your records are sitting out in St. Louis. Why would we
 23 go there? Well, it had been a military records center
 24 for years and years, and those records that are now --
 25 really should be in one of the other repositories are

1 still sitting there. Massive amounts of records that
 2 haven't really been processed since they were originally
 3 put there 50 years ago. Things end up there that you
 4 kind of go, why are they here?

5 We also did a very extensive aerial photo research,
 6 and I think we've got -- we've purchased a handful of
 7 different additional aerial photos, but we also are
 8 aware of pretty much what was available both
 9 commercially and governmentally as far as that goes.

10 The highlights of the ASR, like I said, this is a
 11 standardized format, these are chapter headings. So
 12 it's not two previous studies. This is Section II of
 13 the ASR.

14 So we talk about what previous -- we have sections
 15 in the report that talked about previous studies; the
 16 history, which isn't listed, we pretty much say go to
 17 the NPS web site, the National Park Service; and then we
 18 talk about these other elements. I will discuss each of
 19 these in the slides that follow, the highlights of
 20 what's going on.

21 In the previous studies, it seems to be most
 22 effective or most, I guess, relating to this, there was
 23 a 1983 installation assessment, and basically they gave
 24 themselves a week to come here and find out everything.
 25 I not sure, given the time and money that they did, I

1 don't think I could have done a better job, but on the
 2 whole it wasn't a very good report, and the information
 3 out of it wasn't terribly helpful.

4 In 1990, they did an aerial photo interp, which was
 5 primarily concerned about hazardous and toxic wastes.
 6 Marginal assistance there.

7 The '86 study on explosives surveys where they did
 8 the wipe samples determining, you know, if this is
 9 Central Magazine, is there any explosive residue or
 10 hazards resulting from that, explosive hazards?

11 The most useful report was the '97 SI on Small Arms
 12 Ranges, and for the most part we didn't have too many --
 13 our findings didn't disagree with theirs except for one
 14 of the sizes of the range I think was miscalculated.
 15 They called the Crissy Field Rifle Range, a range, and
 16 it was really more of a what -- from a current military
 17 standpoint of a -- it was a dry fire range where you
 18 just kind of go and practice holding the rifle and
 19 aiming the rifle and you don't shoot anything.

20 It also didn't identify any non-small arms. When I
 21 say "small arms," I'm talking bullets out of a rifle as
 22 opposed to bigger projectiles and other things. It
 23 didn't identify any of those, and we'll talk about those
 24 as the other slides come on.

25 Okay. So, what did we find out about explosive use

1 within the boundaries of the Presidio? They used both
 2 practice and high explosives. When I say "practice,"
 3 practice could mean something as inert, like a dummy
 4 round. It's completely innocuous and totally like a --
 5 a good example would be those -- the hand grenades that
 6 you can see at the gag shops or the army surplus that
 7 are solid cast iron that are totally inert, to --
 8 practice could also mean like a similar type of hand
 9 grenade where it is outfitted with a pyrotechnic or kind
 10 of a firecracker type of thing so that when you -- it's
 11 a little more sophisticated than when you pull the ring
 12 and toss it, it will pop or it will create a smoke
 13 effect, and high explosives where you would be -- the
 14 actual use of high explosives. Although we didn't find
 15 any definitive information regarding high explosive use
 16 of hand grenades.

17 It also includes smokes, irritants. When I say
 18 "irritants" and "riot control agents," these are the
 19 tear gas. So that when the guys are having to wear gas
 20 masks, you release tear gas just to make sure that
 21 they are -- they're called "confidence courses" because
 22 you're trying to give them confidence that the gas mask
 23 is actually sealing and will protect them against bad,
 24 nasty things.

25 Those are the types of weapons, and we identified

1 them in a number of different areas. We know primarily
 2 where most of the small arms ranges are; we're less
 3 clear where some of these other activities were. I'll
 4 talk about each of those in a minute.

5 So this picture here, it's kind of hard to tell,
 6 this is reportedly up near the Broadway Gate, which
 7 would be the upper north -- no, it would be the
 8 southeastmost corner of the Presidio, and it looks -- if
 9 you look and you see the roads, it looks like it's
 10 firing westward. That's about all you can make of that.
 11 It's an ascertainment of it. I mean this is a field
 12 artillery piece.

13 We do know and we do have firing records where they
 14 are saying, this is what we shot, this is the results of
 15 our practice firing; that they were using -- firing a
 16 field mortar -- a B.L.R. is (INAUDIBLE) rifle, which
 17 isn't terribly important to this discussion -- up to
 18 1700 yards. So there's limits of ways you can shoot in
 19 Presidio and still get 1720 yards.

20 By what they're firing at, the description of the
 21 target, it's clear that they're firing on land and it's
 22 not at a water target. Frequently, like in seacoast
 23 batteries, they're floating targets out in the water a
 24 lot to fire at them. I mean that's their mission.
 25 Their mission is to be able to take out boats as they're

1 coming in to get the bad guys. But these are not.

2 Later we know that they were using larger field
 3 guns. When I say "field guns," these are guns that are
 4 mobil. They're on wheels, they can move them around.
 5 They're not like these permanent gun emplacements that
 6 we see the huge concrete remains of. These are field
 7 guns and they're firing them towards Marin Headlands
 8 from Fort Winfield Scott. We've got some fairly good
 9 information about where that's occurring.

10 We also know that in later times that they're using
 11 mortars, but it's not clear where they're being fired,
 12 and the ranges on those is kind of small.

13 Typically these were for demonstration, not
 14 necessarily a, we need to practice this over and over
 15 again. When I'm talking about this, this is typically
 16 for, we want to show what it will look like to have a
 17 smoke -- a huge smoke cloud come out. So they'll throw
 18 a bunch of rounds down the range to create the smoke
 19 effect for, I guess, demonstrations.

20 During World War I, this was a major training camp
 21 before people left to go overseas, and as a result there
 22 was a large number of trenches. We never found any maps
 23 showing us where the trenches were, so what really came
 24 is that we were able to find some aerial photos. This
 25 one is from 1923 and this is the Infantry Terrace area.

1 So Inspiration Point is probably down in here.

2 It's kind of hard to tell, but these areas here are
 3 trenches. It's a very distinctive signature on aerial
 4 photos that that's what they are.

5 I guess when Craig was first introducing me and
 6 showing me around when we were looking through where the
 7 bottles were found, I'm like, "Well, you know Craig,
 8 that looks like the trenches."
 9 "Well, by gosh, it does."

10 So I think there are remains of those out there. A
 11 lot of other parts of it have been replaced with housing
 12 and have erased traces of where those trenches were.

13 Now, why are trenches important? Well, part of the
 14 reason trenches are important is that they -- we know in
 15 World War I they trained with rifle -- hand grenades and
 16 rifle grenades, and it's not generally at a specified
 17 location.

18 But we also know that World War I, which is kind of
 19 -- we've got two pieces of information. It's like,
 20 well, they're firing at the trenches. Well, we know
 21 where the trenches are and we know where this is
 22 happening. So it's implied that it's at these other
 23 areas, but that's not a completely known trait.

24 Primarily what they're firing is smoke and tear
 25 gas. One of the other areas that -- we'll see this

1 particular area. We identified it on a map, but it's
2 also fairly clear from this aerial photo. This is the
3 Golden Gate Bridge being constructed, one of the
4 (INAUDIBLE) path. I think you guys identified this as
5 where the McDonald's is?

6 MR. COOPER: Burger King.

7 MR. CURTIS: Burger King. This is Halleck
8 Avenue here and Lincoln Boulevard. This is also a
9 parking lot.

10 But this area we're seeing here, it's all kind of
11 ladder-like. This is a typical grenade court where
12 they're figuring out how far somebody can throw it.
13 Then there's (INAUDIBLE) rounds start here, and it looks
14 like maybe they're pits to simulate maybe machine gun
15 nests that you practice seeing how accurate you can be
16 here, and you can lob maybe an inert grenade or a
17 practice grenade into one of these locations.

18 There's this little -- another one here. This
19 looks to be another trench. It's very distinctive
20 sawtooth pattern. Very typical of trenches.

21 Given its proximity to all this other -- used
22 installations and housing, it's pretty clear that they
23 wouldn't use the high-explosive grenades because you'd
24 be fragging all these people around here. But once
25 again, that's the assumption.

1 It's not at all atypical. Actually, I was a little
2 surprised that they stopped by June '26, because it had
3 been standard practice for them to bomb airfields before
4 they had a lot of bombing targets elsewhere. I know
5 that there are other places that I can go through
6 numerous accounts of where they're -- even '20s and
7 '30s -- where they're bombing airfields with practice
8 rounds.

9 The point was: We know that they didn't have high
10 explosives because none of these things were paved.
11 These were grass fields. They didn't really want to
12 destroy their own airfields and there really wasn't a
13 lot of planes. So there's a very small amount of use at
14 Crissy Field.

15 Okay, now let's get to the chemical warfare. I put
16 the full definition of chemical warfare up here that you
17 guys can read on your own. I think that the key points
18 to remember are it's not -- when you say V- and G-
19 series nerve agents, it's not nerve agents.

20 Like when you hear about the serin attack in the
21 Tokyo subway and things like that, this isn't the type
22 of things. Those were the weapons that were developed
23 in World War II by the Germans. Those were the really
24 bad, nasty agents.

25 The stuff that we're seeing here are the blister

1 Okay. Crissy Field. The pilots there were
2 primarily an observation squadron. But even as an
3 observation squadron, they were required to do strafing
4 (PHONETIC) training, bombing training, and air training.

5 Strafing is where they're firing small arms, with
6 the guns on their planes, at the ground. Air to air is
7 where they're shooting it at some element in the air.
8 Typically it would be a pulled-cloth target as opposed
9 to like actually shooting another plane. They're also
10 using bombs. Here's a nice picture of all these other
11 bombs and stuff.

12 We do know that on at least a couple of occasions
13 they were using dummy rounds. When they say "dummy,"
14 that typically means completely inert. It has the right
15 shape but no explosive element.

16 And live rounds. When I say "live rounds" here, I
17 mean practice rounds. But from the details of the
18 documentation, they usually are taking the explosives
19 that would fill in this whole bomb and reducing it to
20 that it be only creating a smoke round, so that when it
21 strikes, somebody can spot it and say, "Oh, yes, that's
22 where it hit." A pilot can see where it hit and so can
23 the spotters on the ground. So when we say a "practice
24 round," that's typically what they're talking about with
25 bombing.

1 agents, the H Series and Lewisites, which were all World
2 War I items. Not bad, but the level of bad doesn't
3 compare to the nerve agents.

4 They spent a lot of chemical warfare training these
5 guys to be able to identify these things by smell.
6 Because with the World War I air stuff, you can smell
7 it. It's like, "Oh," (sniffing) "okay, this smells like
8 garlic." If you smell something that smells like
9 garlic, that means it's mustard. If you smell Lewisite,
10 it smells like geraniums. They made all sorts of
11 training efforts and we'll explain some of that more.

12 But specifically excluded -- this definition is by
13 International Treaty and that's why it's kind of long
14 and specific. But it's kind of confusing, because if
15 you look at historical documents, you'll see things that
16 say "CWM," and they're talking about chemical warfare
17 materials because these are materials that belong to the
18 Chemical Warfare Service. They would include all these
19 other elements, riot control agents, historically.

20 But that's not the current definition, and we as
21 the Army -- this report isn't just for the people in
22 this room or for Bruce. This report goes to other
23 people that are very concerned about the specifics of
24 this.

25 The key point is that not all chemical warfare

1 activities equal chemical warfare materials, by today's
2 definition. And because they're all being developed and
3 being sponsored by the Chemical Warfare Service, they
4 kind of overlap. And then in the histories and all the
5 records, they're all in the same place.

6 MR. COOPER: So in your search you included
7 both?

8 MR. CURTIS: Right. When we talk about --
9 typically what will happen is like a stove that's
10 warming. It looks like an iron pipe. It can be used to
11 fire an explosive round. It can be used to fire a smoke
12 round. It can be used to fire -- I mean project nasty
13 mustard agents and things like that. Just by kind of
14 looking at it, it's kind of hard to tell unless you
15 really, really know what you're doing.

16 I tried to break up the activities kind of by what
17 munitions are going on in chemical warfare. Statically
18 used munitions being items that have a very limited --
19 or they're things that are placed and they don't go
20 anywhere. Dynamically ones are the ones that fired and
21 go down range. Neither of these categories do we
22 believe had any chemical warfare materials in them.

23 This other category are what we'd call "chemical
24 warfare materials." These are things where they had
25 actual agent in them to be used in training.

1 So this is the one that's kind of one of the major
2 elements of interest, and this is -- the bottles that
3 were found last October fall under this category.

4 The locations where this was done is primarily
5 Battery Chamberlain and Baker Beach. Chemical Warfare
6 Service had that area after World War II, pretty much
7 exclusively until like 1974 when they made the agreement
8 to pass it over to the National Park Service, and then
9 they moved it Battery Dynamite.

10 There were other areas that they did this,
11 especially for the elements that do not require a large
12 space. I'll get to that in more detail. You don't have
13 to go very far. You don't need a large, huge area to
14 train in. You'll see what I mean when I get to those
15 other examples after we identify some other locations.

16 So I'm not sure who -- somebody in the RAB group
17 identified this out of the -- our Letterman Foghorn
18 newsletter last year. When we first started this
19 research, Craig is like, "Here. This is important.
20 This is something you want to take a look at."

21 These look like the housing around Infantry
22 Terrace. They're showing them obviously doing this --
23 it's very close into the housing areas, and that's not
24 atypical for what we call the "statically used
25 munitions".

1 This fire grenade and instructional bomb -- they
2 have bombs that are being used here. This is kind of
3 like, well, you just told me that they only bombed from
4 1925 to '26, nine months; now you're telling me they had
5 bombs here in 1943. Well, what they would do, and this
6 was common practices, they would give a unit an
7 incendiary bomb, a bomb that was meant to start fires.
8 They spent a lot of effort and money to be able to start
9 fires to burn the bad guys in World War II.

10 Hence, we were also teaching our troops how to put
11 out these fires. That's what's going on in these
12 pictures is they're setting these fire bombs off and
13 showing these guys how to fight these fires. That
14 doesn't take a lot of room.

15 Other examples of it would be with tear gas. So if
16 I were lecturing you all on how to wear a gas mask, we'd
17 all have our gas mask on, and hopefully we'd all have it
18 on correctly, and then somebody would pop off a tear-gas
19 grenade and set it down and it would dissipate across
20 the room, and ideally everybody would gain confidence
21 that their masks worked and the end product would be you
22 flipped it off and you started crying because of the
23 irritant. Once again, that isn't travelling very far.

24 They also used these other things like candles.
25 Sounds like it's an actual candle. What it is, is

1 actually like a -- think of it as a tin can that when
2 you wipe it clean, it's releasing smoke or tear gas.

3 Capsules would be just a capsule. It's kind of how
4 they do it now, they pop the capsule and it releases
5 things. You can do it with a grenade.

6 Pots. I don't know if you've seen those smoke pots
7 that the Highway Department uses. Think of it as
8 another tin can.

9 Bomb would be -- the land mines. There are things
10 called "chemical land mines," and these look like the
11 old, one-gallon gas cans that you probably used when
12 lawn mowing back in the '70s. I know we had one when I
13 was a kid.

14 They would fill those with -- typically with a
15 molasses by-product that when they would set it off it
16 would spray molasses over everything. That way you
17 could pretend like you contaminated something with
18 something that really wasn't a problem. It was a sticky
19 mess.

20 They would also use these land mines for actual
21 agents, mustard. Those would all be fairly static.
22 They're known where they're at and the hazards
23 associated with them will be probably minimal because
24 after the exercise is over, you'd pick it up and -- or
25 you'd clean it up and it's not being transferred

1 anywhere.

2 The dynamically ones are a little different.
3 You're throwing or projecting something and it's not as
4 readily clear how -- where they might land. Most of
5 what's happening of this is the smoke and rifle
6 grenades. When I say "grenades," I mean hand and rifle
7 grenades. There are limited range of how far those go,
8 but I'm not exactly sure where that training record is.

9 There will be training records saying, this is
10 happening, or we'll find inventory records saying, this
11 is how many we had this month, and then the next month
12 we kind of go, well, they had 50 less in March than they
13 had in February, so they -- i.e., they probably used 50
14 grenades. But they don't typically say where it's
15 happening.

16 They also did demonstration items of these other
17 (INAUDIBLE) or mortar projectile things. Never found a
18 standard, heavily duty-used mortar range. This is more
19 for just demonstration purposes. They had other places.
20 When they needed to go and do a large amount of
21 training, they would typically go down to Fort Ord or
22 other places.

23 Then it comes back to these chemical agent
24 identification sets, and I'm going to spend a little
25 time explaining what they thought of.

1 They had small amounts of agent in them. Here's an
2 example of what we call the "instructional" or the
3 "sniff set." It's a bottle that you pull the lid off of
4 it and you smell it, and that was supposed to give you
5 an idea of what the agent actually smells like.

6 You would do this in a classroom environment, very
7 much like we would do when we pass it around and
8 everybody would get a whiff of the mustard and
9 (INAUDIBLE) very good. Then maybe the next month when
10 you did your training, the word mustard was -- on the
11 label, would be covered over, so you'd have to try and
12 remember it was mustard.

13 They also have what we call "detonating kits,"
14 which would be vials or test tubes that had agent in
15 them that they would set on a detonator and they would
16 have -- they would set it off. Once it went off, they
17 would have the entire group of about a dozen or two
18 people go run through the clouds so that they could
19 whiff what these agents smelled like when they might
20 explode in the field, which would be more realistic than
21 these little sniff sets.

22 The third was the toxic set, which is what we saw
23 at the beginning. The primary (INAUDIBLE) need for the
24 toxic set was once again that the first two types are
25 trying to teach guys to be able to identify this stuff

1 by smell; whereas the third type, the toxic set was to
2 be able to contaminate an area and have the guys be able
3 to detect it and then decontaminate it.

4 The sniff sets are there by 1930; '33, the
5 detonation sets; and it's not until World War II that
6 the toxic gas sets.

7 There was also what we call "bulk agent," agent
8 that's coming in in an amount that's not in the caskets.
9 So we know that a hundred pounds was here in '20. And
10 it seemed to be a bunch of these were used in gopher
11 extermination. Not just on the Presidio but in a number
12 of areas. They've used a lot of chlorine.

13 It was kind of -- I don't want to say humorous --
14 okay, it was humorous that different, like, gardeners
15 and groundskeepers are asking the Chemical Warfare
16 Service to come in and show them how to use this stuff
17 and to exterminate their pests.

18 Another thing would be -- is more concern is that
19 in the later -- in the mid '40s when they're doing this
20 training, we didn't find great, solid records saying,
21 okay, yeah, this agent is doing this amount of training
22 with this much mustard.

23 But we found standardized tables saying, okay, this
24 unit needs to be training with this much, this is what
25 they need to be trained to meet requirements, blah,

1 blah, blah, and those allowances are typically gallons
2 of mustard. Those might be used in contamination
3 exercises. So this could be for maybe those caskets
4 with the toxic sets or it could be in larger containers.

5 The training here between -- World War I, a lot of
6 people were like, "Well, this really was a headquarters
7 base. There wasn't a lot of training." Well, that's
8 not the case. We actually found a lot of great records
9 for the period between the two wars.

10 The Chemical Warfare Office for the Ninth Corps was
11 here, and he was responsible for this 302nd Chemical
12 Regiment, which was kind of like a reserve unit. These
13 were weekend warriors types of guys, and they would come
14 here and train. Then those guys were then responsible
15 for giving assistance to, like, the National Guard in
16 California, and some of their training in and around the
17 area, the ROTC, and the CMTC, which is the citizen
18 military training camp.

19 These were, I guess, camps you would go to during
20 the summer. And if you did it four years in a row, by
21 the time you were out, you could be commissioned as an
22 officer, in case of a war. They were quite popular in
23 the teens, and the '20s, and '30s. There's also the
24 30th Infantry Regiment.

25 We have very good records on what kind of things

1 they were doing, how often. This is -- they were having
 2 to send in monthly reports saying, this is how much
 3 training, this is what we did. But these reports very
 4 rarely said, this is where we did it and this is how
 5 much material it expended. So you'd get good
 6 information and then you're kind of going, well, but I
 7 want more.

8 During World War II, the Ninth Corps is here. We
 9 didn't find records that said what the monthly reports
 10 are, but by 1944 the required yearly training would all
 11 have been with actual mustard agents. The contaminated
 12 areas were to be in a very isolated, fenced off area,
 13 about 200 yards. That kind of really limits the number
 14 of places that could be done on the Presidio based on
 15 the housing that was present during World War II.

16 Following the war, the 6th Army was here. I guess
 17 in the early '50s they decided -- there was a very
 18 heightened concern about, not just chemical, but what we
 19 call chemical, biological and radiological problems and
 20 concerns just in general.

21 They did a large staff of training. So each
 22 element of the Army, like the 1st Army, the 2nd Army,
 23 and the 6th Army headquartered here, established a CBR
 24 school. So the CBR school for the 6th Army was here,
 25 and it was pretty much out at Battery Chamberlain and

1 Fort McClellan in Alabama.

2 But that didn't end the training here. They
 3 continued to have refresher training, but the amount of
 4 training was much reduced, and by the '60s, it's mostly
 5 just gas masks on.

6 Battery Chamberlain goes away when they give Baker
 7 Beach the MPS, and by (INAUDIBLE), Battery Dynamite.
 8 But most of the exercises are actually (INAUDIBLE) out
 9 at parks.

10 I threw this slide in that -- we talked -- we found
 11 a number of maps. I guess maybe several dozen of them
 12 ended up in the report. Primarily, we were looking at
 13 them for OE and CWM.

14 This is a copy of a 1939 map, which --that aerial
 15 photo where I was showing you the hand grenade area,
 16 this is Lincoln, Halleck, and then the Golden Gate by
 17 the -- and it says, "hand grenade area." You can't
 18 really read that, but it says, "Building 205," that it
 19 was Building 205. These two are the two small arms
 20 ranges. These are target butts for pistol ranges. This
 21 is the machine gun photo up here. Both of those have
 22 been previously identified.

23 So we went through. And the report contains a fair
 24 amount of discussion about what each of those maps says,
 25 as well as (INAUDIBLE). We also did the same thing with

1 Baker. They trained officers and NCOs to be able to go
 2 back and handle the CBR training back at their units
 3 elsewhere within the 6th Army; that would be Nevada,
 4 Utah, Idaho, Northern California.

5 They spent time with detection and things like
 6 that.

7 This picture here, which isn't terribly good, it
 8 came out horribly scanned, here's the Golden Gate
 9 Bridge, and you could see this nice pyrotechnic
 10 explosion trying to simulate a -- I think it's actually
 11 supposed to simulate a nuclear weapon. Very, very, very
 12 small one.

13 The guys on the beach, I mean you can -- on the
 14 actual newspaper article it's very clearly Baker Beach.
 15 It just close by and they did a different kind of
 16 training.

17 They did this training not just only for military
 18 folks, but they would also do it for local -- civil
 19 defense folks. So they would have like civil defense
 20 folks from San Francisco come in and they'd give them a
 21 dog-and-pony show for a couple of hours and try and give
 22 them a best-of presentation.

23 But after they figured they got enough of these
 24 people trained, the schools are being established, most
 25 of this training then became headquartered at

1 aerial photos. We were looking primarily to identify
 2 things on aerial photos to make sure if it matched up
 3 with what the map said versus the textual information;
 4 that was how we were able to find those trenches.

5 We were only able to identify the one set of
 6 trenches. That doesn't mean there weren't necessarily
 7 more, but those were the only ones that we could clearly
 8 identify. And we were really only looking for
 9 coordinates of explosives and chemical warfare materials
 10 that we could positively say, yea, verily, this is it.
 11 We didn't try to make too many speculative guesses.

12 There's a section in the report that -- Section
 13 VII, it talks about -- basically it's like a laundry
 14 list saying, here are all the types of items that we
 15 (INAUDIBLE) identified, da, ding, da, ding, da, ding and
 16 it leads to a bunch of what we call "technical data
 17 sheets". They're kind of one-page affairs, and this is
 18 an example of what a smoke grenade looks like, kind of
 19 what its size is, et cetera.

20 There's probably about 70 or 80 of those in the
 21 report of items that we think are associated here as
 22 typical. It's not comprehensive, but it gives a fairly
 23 good background of what is probably here.

24 I almost apologize and have to explain to Craig
 25 that (INAUDIBLE), is that military munitions response

1 areas are important. MMR is an important acronym to the
2 Army in that the Army, the Air Force, and the Marine
3 Corps, et cetera, all have to respond to the Senate and
4 Congress about where their past and active, current
5 ranges are and the major effort outside of this effort
6 and the relationship to them.

7 So the easy way to think of this slide is these are
8 where the ranges are. So these are the smaller ranges
9 that we were able to positively identify for other
10 ranges. I think it's really only at this Torpedo Wharf
11 Range, and I think the hand grenades are in the other.
12 And I think the other ones have been previously
13 identified.

14 We had less clear areas about where these type of
15 things may have been fired. They kind of say things
16 like they did simulated battles on Crissy Field for
17 demonstration purposes. I'm not sure that's a really
18 big concern. These other ones are kind of up to
19 interpretation.

20 Then there is a whole series of other ranges where
21 it's not clear exactly where it is, based on the
22 information we had. One of them is Old Rock Quarry. It
23 could be in -- I think there were three quarries on site
24 at the time, and it could be the quarry that ends up
25 where the National Cemetery was, because there was a

1 pistol range that the Corps (INAUDIBLE), or it could be
2 one of the other quarries. It's really just not clear.

3 We mapped these out as to where they were located,
4 as best we could, finding them based on maps and aerial
5 photos.

6 The trench area kind of overlays here and kind of
7 touches in to the Barnard and rifle range. You can see
8 the housing covers a good hunk of those. But this area
9 here I guess is about where the bottles were found.

10 The chemical warfare activities areas is less
11 clear. Gas chambers; we didn't identify a location for
12 any of those, in the '20s and '30s. We identified
13 several other areas after that. Not terribly concerned
14 about gas chambers. It's the Army's experience that
15 there is known quantities, they're statically used
16 things, and typically temporary buildings didn't last
17 very long. There's not really ever been an identifiable
18 hazard with them. They sound exciting, but they're
19 really not terribly.

20 Same thing with offices and storages. A lot of
21 times when you look through maps, they'll say "chemical
22 warehouse" or "Chemical Warfare Service office," and it
23 sounds kind of like something is going on there, but
24 typically these are just office buildings and where
25 they're storing the gas masks.

1 I think one of these buildings is the park
2 archives. It's the old park archives and the stables.
3 Well, during World War II, it was being used as the gas
4 mask storage warehouse.

5 The training areas that we were able to identify
6 were primarily associated with Battery Chamberlain and
7 Baker Beach.

8 Here's a nice area where they're showing where a
9 gas chamber is, just up the line from Battery
10 Chamberlain. The area where the toxic gas bottles were
11 found last year was never clearly identified as a
12 chemical warfare training area.

13 Any questions?

14 MS. BLUM: On your list of resources at the
15 beginning of your report, which would have been the
16 primary military agency as a resource for documenting
17 weapons and activities on the Presidio, is there any one
18 in particular that should be primary or like the
19 controlling recordkeeper?

20 MR. CURTIS: Well, I'll explain a little bit
21 about the National Archive system. I think that might
22 answer your question. The Army turned over the park
23 archives that sits out -- that the National Park Service
24 runs, and most of the drawings, et cetera, for the park
25 remained and they stay there. That's pretty useful.

1 The other records that were -- I mean some of the
2 records that the Army had at that time stayed here.
3 Some of them went to Fort Lewis, Washington. Those
4 would have been primarily the more recent articles.
5 Some of those also would have gone to what we call a
6 "records center".

7 What you've asked is a big question. When the
8 government has records, and if they can store them on a
9 boat somewhere, they can say, okay, this war gas is over
10 here. I'll just throw all these boxes over here and
11 I'll ignore them. Well, they're really not supposed to
12 do that.

13 They're supposed to have a standardized -- not
14 they're supposed to, they do. We have standardized
15 procedures saying this is how often you're supposed to
16 have it. Some of them very clearly say, these records
17 are to be destroyed after two years.

18 Ideally what happens is that. Like in this area,
19 they would say, "Okay, I want to get rid of these boxes;
20 where is the nearest Federal Records Center?" The
21 nearest Federal Records Center here is the facility down
22 at San Bruno, next to, I guess, the Tanforan mall area
23 is, there's -- where the National Archives is.

24 So there's actually two facilities in that one
25 building. One is the Federal Records Center which

1 houses records that still belong to the service that put
2 them there. So like Sacramento District has records
3 that are at the Federal Records Center because it's the
4 closest Federal Records Center to Sacramento District.

5 Sacramento District of Corps of Engineers still
6 owns those records and nobody can look at those records
7 unless they say, yea, verily, you can look at those
8 records, because they belong to the organization until
9 that organization says, "You know, we know longer need
10 them, they can be destroyed," or, if they're of value to
11 the American people still, they can be turned over to
12 the National Archives, which is the same building. This
13 would be the public information.

14 Actually, the other stuff available to the public
15 you would have to have permission from the owning
16 agency. So that's how some of the records would get to
17 San Bruno, and those would be local records.

18 Now, at National Records, these are usually more
19 headquarter-level records, things that are being sent up
20 the chain to, like, all the offices in D.C. Those
21 records go the same way. They go to records centers
22 typically first and then to archives. How you navigate
23 and find those records, I can spend another couple of
24 hours talking about.

25 MR. COOPER: Does that answer your question?

1 MS. BLUM: I think it answered my question
2 because there really isn't one local place, and it's a
3 big hunt and peck and maybe you're lucky and maybe you
4 aren't.

5 MR. KERN: It looked like there was a lot of
6 activity at Baker Beach, and Baker Beach is used by a
7 few people now and then today. I'm just wondering as
8 part of this report or other activities, has there been
9 an examination of Baker Beach, some sort of -- have
10 people gone through that area before it was turned over?

11 MR. CURTIS: I'm sure the area was gone over
12 before it was turned over. Typically after these
13 exercises -- I mean we even have some examples in the
14 documentation saying, "Okay, after our little
15 dog-and-pony demonstration, everybody go and clean up
16 the beach. Please help find every bit and piece."

17 So they're going to find stuff that (INAUDIBLE)
18 their training (INAUDIBLE), but they'll also find stuff
19 that happened probably a week ago. So it gets cleaned
20 up. But that's standard practice.

21 Typically the items that are doing there are not --
22 now is kind of where I was getting back to the
23 statically versus dynamic. They're not things that are
24 going real far. These are things that are fairly
25 in-place items, more statically charged so that they're

1 not really getting away from them.

2 MR. SUTTER: Does your report include any
3 conclusions and/or recommendations? A lot of data here.

4 MR. CURTIS: There's a lot of data there.

5 MR. SUTTER: Is there an evaluation? Are there
6 recommendations that are recommended as far as the
7 report?

8 MR. HANDEL: I'll answer that. As I mentioned
9 before, I'm having the Archive Search Report forwarded
10 to our Huntsville Office Center of Expertise for
11 Ordinance and Explosives, Chemical Weapons. They're
12 evaluating it. They'll provide me with recommendations.
13 That's what -- one of the services they provide to the
14 Corps of Engineers.

15 MR. SUTTER: That process is not complete.

16 MR. HANDEL: Correct.

17 MR. CURTIS: And that's not -- that's how the
18 process works always. We don't make recommendations.
19 We are -- and it's been very clear, it's like, we can
20 say things like this is what we know type of things, but
21 we're not supposed to be --

22 MR. COOPER: Bruce, just to kind of further --
23 how long do you think it will take Huntsville to come
24 back with some recommendations for next steps?

25 MR. HANDEL: I should have something in

1 December.

2 MR. CURTIS: Can I throw out a caveat on that,
3 in case it takes longer? Huntsville is snowed. The
4 people that do this are -- a lot of them are being
5 deployed, have been deployed. A lot of the same guys
6 that do this are the ones that are going overseas to be
7 making decisions on running the contracts for -- keeping
8 the oil fields open and making sure that the explosives
9 aren't there in the oil fields in Iraq. They're also
10 the ones that are managing the destruction of all the
11 ammunition at Iraq that we captured. It's just a
12 higgledy-piggledy mess. So if it's not December, don't
13 be surprised.

14 MR. BERMAN: I'd just like to follow up on
15 Doug's question. The implication that I got from your
16 presentation tonight was that Baker Beach area was
17 clearly identified as a place where there was some CW
18 activity; whereas the lower Inspiration Point where the
19 bottles were found is only vaguely identified or maybe
20 even not identified clearly as a training area.

21 Given that conclusion, if that's correct, it would
22 seem to me that in spite of the fact that one thinks
23 that Baker Beach is clean, that since those areas are
24 now likely to be remediated quite soon, is it of value
25 for some further investigation there, other than the

1 remediation, in order to insure that whatever
2 activities, whatever CW activities occurred there, that
3 the cleanup of those things has really been
4 comprehensive?

5 MR. COOPER: Are you talking about the
6 landfills up on the bluffs or are you talking down on
7 the beach itself?

8 MR. BERMAN: Well, both, because I mean even
9 though the munitions were static, it's not that far from
10 the bluff to the -- from the landfills and the bluffs to
11 the beach. I mean it's only like maybe 50 yards in some
12 cases, which is well within the range of even the static
13 materials.

14 So the question is whether there's any value beyond
15 the proposed remediation in view of this report to
16 review the possibility of some residual CW activity
17 material?

18 MR. HANDEL: I think the answer to that will
19 come out of what Huntsville recommends to me, or to the
20 Sacramento District.

21 What we have is we know -- we have found bottles in
22 the trenches below Inspiration Point, so we know that
23 something occurred there. We see photographs of
24 activity occurring on Baker Beach. So we know that
25 there's something there. We don't know how often it

1 occurred, in either place, but we know that something
2 occurred there.

3 I would love to -- Huntsville at this point to make
4 a recommendation. They may say the incendiaries or the
5 mustard, whatever was used in this kind of instance, it
6 naturally degrades in 10 or 15 years. I know certain
7 CWMs degrade very rapidly in the open oxygen.

8 I don't have the answers to some of the specifics,
9 but that's why I look to the Center of Expertise.

10 MR. ULLENSVANG: Is it possible to ask your
11 experts if they could make an early determination if
12 there is an imminent hazard to the public there?

13 MR. HANDEL: Sure, I can ask them.

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think that's what Sam's
15 asking, is there something we need to do urgently to
16 protect the public at Baker Beach?

17 MR. HANDEL: Actually, I think he was asking me
18 about if we could make sure and take into consideration
19 the CWM whenever we do some other remediation.

20 MR. BERMAN: Right. Right.

21 MR. ULLENSVANG: We need like a stand on it.
22 If you could ask them if they could early look at it to
23 see if there is a need to restrict public access in the
24 area because of some imminent hazard that might be
25 there.

1 MR. HANDEL: Certainly.

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: And that way if there is a
3 public threat or a likelihood of a public threat, we can
4 be informed and take an appropriate action prior to any
5 sort of determination of a final action. Thanks.

6 MR. BUDROE: Randy, you basically talked about
7 usage and really didn't talk about material production
8 or waste disposal; was that not within the scope of the
9 report?

10 MR. CURTIS: Material production didn't occur
11 here. I mean, these items are produced at manufacturing
12 plants from around the country. They're warehoused,
13 typically at depots, and they would be disbursed out.

14 I say that, and -- one element of all this is that
15 excess ammunition for the Greater Bay Area, during like
16 the '50s, came here. So if people needed to get rid of
17 ammo, it's like, "Okay, we have some out-of-date stuff
18 and we no longer need it," they would bring it here and
19 it would be stored on site -- it appears to probably be
20 one of the old magazines -- and then it would then be
21 destroyed or shipped back to one of the depots. So this
22 was kind of a collection point for that type of thing.
23 Now --

24 MR. HANDEL: Actually, I have an opinion that
25 differs with that. Benicia Arsenal was a collection

1 point for much of the Bay area.

2 MR. CURTIS: Okay. Then you start getting into
3 issues about points of times that this is happening. We
4 know this happened for at least a period of time here.
5 And I'm not sure how much, how far or how --

6 MS. TRIGIANI: How can you two have different
7 opinions on what actually what happened?

8 MR. CURTIS: Periods of times. Because it
9 probably happened both times. The answers are probably
10 both right, that Benicia did it and the Presidio did it.
11 But when you get down into the specifics of what
12 timeframe this happens, makes a big difference.

13 So the missions change based on organizations. So
14 like the headquarters for the Western Defense Command
15 started here and then they were concerned and they moved
16 it out to Salt Lake City to Fort Douglas. So the
17 mission was in two different places, for different
18 reasons, at different times, and it's hard to keep
19 straight sometimes.

20 MR. ANDERSON: Did you identify resources that
21 might be of value to the general review of hazardous
22 material, I mean just dumps that the Presidio is trying
23 to clean up, material that they haven't had before?

24 MR. CURTIS: The aerial photos probably could
25 be used to that, to some extent.

1 MR. ANDERSON: And these would be new photos
2 that would be useful, that they haven't had?

3 MR. CURTIS: They're not going to be old
4 photos. Not previously acquired. Does that make sense?

5 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

6 MR. CURTIS: I don't want to say they're new
7 because they're not new, they're historic.

8 MS. PASSERO: A two-part question. One is you
9 mentioned your Huntsville office is an audience for this
10 report, and who else -- is there anybody else that this
11 report is going to be distributed to?

12 For a bit of background for me, was this report
13 made upon request or is it sort of standard operating
14 procedure?

15 MR. HANDEL: Generally standard operating
16 procedure. It appeared that -- well, it appeared there
17 wasn't one prepared for Presidio of San Francisco.

18 I had earlier been involved in the environmental
19 restoration here. We never really considered ordinance
20 and explosives a problem here. None of the information
21 that had surfaced identified it as a problem.

22 When this instance came up at Inspiration Point,
23 the question was asked: Do we have an Archive Search
24 Report? I researched that and the answer was no. So we
25 went forward with an Archive Search Report.

1 MS. PASSERO: Is this just going to them at
2 your Huntsville office, or is there a wider audience?

3 MR. HANDEL: No. It's being sent to the
4 Huntsville office for them to evaluate it in terms of a
5 recommendation for any additional investigations or any
6 actions or educational programs or what have you. But I
7 intend to distribute it to the Presidio Trust and DTSC.

8 MS. MONAGHAN: I was wondering if the training
9 documented where the things were disposed of after the
10 training was over; would that have been taken off the
11 post and disposed someplace or would it have been
12 disposed on site?

13 MR. CURTIS: Ideally what most of the
14 training -- the items are expended during the training.
15 So the disposed of I guess would be disposed of the
16 empty containers. So the documentation didn't specify.

17 There was an ordinance and explosive disposal area
18 that was located, I think it's at Tennessee Point, over
19 in Fort Cronkite, across the Bay that had been used for
20 a number of years for disposal of ammunition items that
21 were a problem.

22 MS. BLUM: On Page 6 you mention chlorine used
23 in a series of gopher extermination experiments. I
24 wonder -- well, two parts here -- if you know, where on
25 the Presidio that was used -- actually, the first

1 question is, how long does the chlorine stay in an
2 underground scenario without --

3 MR. CURTIS: Don't know. I don't know that
4 answer.

5 MS. BLUM: And then, where is it, would be the
6 second? I have a garden on the Presidio and I'm very
7 interested in the answer to that question.

8 MR. CURTIS: I don't know where they did it.
9 I'm not sure how much of it was actually -- it sounded
10 like there was a number of areas around the Bay area. A
11 golf course, I think, was the main source here on post,
12 but --

13 MS. BLUM: So we won't know where this chlorine
14 was?

15 MR. CURTIS: People aren't keeping the records
16 on that. They may be saying, okay, yeah, we were asked
17 by so and so to do this and give this demonstration, and
18 the City said we can use these chemicals to get rid of
19 these pests. But it's not being very specific about
20 quantities or where. I mean that's just the imperfect
21 nature of the information.

22 I mean, part of it is that the person who wrote the
23 report probably didn't think it was important and didn't
24 write it in the first place.

25 MR. YOUNGKIN: Were you able to narrow down the

1 time period when the bottles were disposed of at
2 Inspiration Point?

3 MR. CURTIS: Well, it had to be World War II or
4 after because they didn't have those particular kits
5 'til that time. Probably the use of those kits is
6 really being -- falling out of favor in the '50s. Well,
7 actually, I shouldn't make -- the decontamination kits
8 were used a bit more. But definitely by 1969 they're
9 not using any of that.

10 MR. YOUNGKIN: Pretty wide range.

11 MR. CURTIS: Pretty wide range.

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: You also said that the training
13 ground where they used these detonation kits had to be
14 200 yards or something like that, so there was only a
15 few areas in the Presidio.

16 MR. CURTIS: No. Well, not the detonation
17 kits. Those would be for contamination area. So, look,
18 contamination area they were looking to do larger
19 quantities of training activities so that they're using
20 more than just small amounts. So these caskets at a
21 time would be considered a small amount; whereas the
22 contamination area would be for the larger amounts.

23 MR. YOUNGKIN: Do you believe there was a
24 contamination area at the Presidio?

25 MR. CURTIS: The standard training

1 documentation said yes, you should have a contamination
2 area. And given the level of training, it appears. But
3 that's not a conclusive statement.

4 I mean a lot of times you get a piece here and a
5 piece here and you're like, what about this one here?
6 You don't always get that.

7 MR. COOPER: But a contamination area would
8 have meant a place where they contaminated it and then
9 decontaminated it.

10 MR. CURTIS: Right. So to some extent,
11 worrying about residual hazards for something like
12 that -- before you finish the exercise you were supposed
13 to be done with the contamination issue. They have --
14 the old sergeant who's running the show is going to be
15 there decontaminating things. It's like, if you don't
16 do it, you've got to keep on. You're not going to let
17 them stop until they're done.

18 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: That was going to be my
19 question, because of the bulk agents slide. We're
20 talking about a gallon of mustard per unit, which is a
21 lot of mustards. It's (INAUDIBLE) materials used in the
22 decontamination that weren't completely decontaminated,
23 would you have the possibility, if you wind up
24 uncovering the landfill, with maybe some residual
25 material, granted it's a long time down the road, if you

1 around here," but the soil and the plant life could have
2 carcinogens for a long time.

3 MR. CURTIS: Once again, I would definitely
4 defer to the guys from Huntsville as to what the
5 breakdown products are. I don't --

6 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: But the question is:
7 Did you see any evidence that chlorine was used as a
8 decontamination agent there, for the decontamination
9 exercises?

10 MR. CURTIS: Decontamination is typically used
11 with super tropical bleach, which is bleach.

12 MR. YOUNGKIN: That article in the "Foghorn"
13 says chlorinated lime. Does that make sense to you?

14 MR. CURTIS: That may be I guess what the --
15 I'm not sure exactly what the chlorinated or bleach is,
16 or I think they call it B.A.N.K. I'm not sure what the
17 acronym for that stands for. But I think it's what
18 they're spreading around; and the lime is to help, I
19 guess -- I don't know the agents -- I think help spread
20 it through.

21 MS. TRIGIANI: You said earlier that you could
22 find no records of where trenches were, and so that sort
23 of prompts a larger question for me. In terms of all
24 these places that you went to do your research, are you
25 confident that you have found all documentation about

1 had something that was burned anerobically, and it
2 hasn't all completely reacted.

3 MR. CURTIS: I would probably try to defer to
4 one of the guys from Huntsville who has a lot more
5 experience. I mean the Huntsville guys are the guys who
6 typically help run the projects that actually remediate
7 these areas.

8 After I'm done with my reports, I generally never
9 hear what happens next. They would be really one of the
10 people that would be able to better respond to a
11 question like that.

12 MR. ANDERSON: The decontamination areas, are
13 you talking about, for example, use of chlorine
14 contamination?

15 MR. CURTIS: It appears at the time that their
16 primary source would have been mustard, at the time that
17 this was going on.

18 MR. ANDERSON: Because I don't know what
19 mustard is even, but chlorine will react with every bit
20 of organic matter, and I assume it cleans itself up in a
21 very short time. It leaves chlorinated organic
22 compounds, which are almost always carcinogenic, for --
23 I don't know -- a lot longer time.

24 So if somebody came around to decontaminate the
25 area, you could say, "Well, there's no more chlorine

1 the Presidio?

2 MR. CURTIS: Absolutely not. I think anybody
3 who would ever tell you they found every piece of paper
4 associated with the Presidio would be lying. It's not
5 possible.

6 MS. TRIGIANI: Be patient with me. But how
7 then do we trust that all the information has been
8 unearthed that we need to know in order to make a
9 decision about whether there's still chemical warfare
10 agents on the Presidio? Do you understand?

11 MR. CURTIS: It's -- it seems -- it's a good
12 question.

13 MS. TRIGIANI: Why go through this exercise if
14 you can't be confident that you've unearthed 80 percent
15 or 70 percent of the documentation?

16 MR. CURTIS: This report took longer than
17 originally expected, and it's cost more money, because
18 as we thought we had additional places that we thought
19 were going to be valuable sources, we traced them down.

20 When we started running out of money, I said,
21 "Bruce, to do a good effort on this, it's going to take
22 more." That didn't make him happy necessarily, running
23 the report, but that's what it takes.

24 Now, as far as -- I don't want to -- we looked in
25 the places we thought we had a strong likelihood or even

1 a mediocre likelihood of finding this information.

2 Now, it gets back to the whole question about
3 how the national archive system -- this is a major
4 amount of paper. And paper is misfiled. It's not in
5 the places you expect it to be.

6 We have found as we're going through one site and
7 we'll finish up a report, then we'll have -- be dealing
8 from another site somewhere in the country, and we'll
9 find out this wonderful document about the report we
10 finished a couple of years ago.

11 What's happened is, is that somebody needed a copy
12 of a range regulation or a training manual and they
13 used -- Camp Swampy someplace is an example -- and they
14 used it to prepare their own example. But you would
15 never think to look for that document in that other
16 place, but it's there.

17 And that is why I can say absolutely, there's no
18 way you could find every record that would be associated
19 with the Presidio. But then you start going -- there's
20 diminishing returns. It's like we could keep on --I
21 mean, I could be employed for the rest of my life
22 looking for records and not really turning up a lot.

23 I've done a bunch of research for Bruce on Dugway
24 Proving Ground. We were really given carte blanche
25 to -- I don't want to say spend money -- but they really

1 simpler if we weren't there.

2 MS. TRIGIANI: Thank you.

3 MR. YOUNGKIN: Is there a procedure for having
4 these aerial photos given to the Environmental Program?

5 MR. CURTIS: I think we had a bunch of them
6 scanned in. We've given them to the library and they're
7 in the process of putting them into their system.

8 MR. YOUNGKIN: Thank you.

9 MR. PONTON: I know we've researched
10 (INAUDIBLE) stretched 60 or 70 years, but is there ever
11 an element of this where you -- people that are still
12 around to interview, people that were actually here to
13 see what they recall happening?

14 MR. CURTIS: We can do that. We did not do
15 that. There's been -- interviews are kind of a mixed
16 bag, and to find the people who you want to talk to is a
17 very difficult item and it's expensive. I mean, if
18 somebody comes forward and says, "Yeah, I know all about
19 it," then you can interview them. But then you're also
20 trying to go, is this a credible person?

21 The Army has spent a lot of money chasing after
22 people that weren't terribly credible. I think of a bad
23 juror at this point, because I am convinced people's
24 memories are horrible. I know mine is. I just --
25 people say, "I remember that, oh, 20 years ago."

1 said, "If you thought you any hint of finding
2 something," they said, "go at it."

3 MR. HANDEL: We spent about \$150,000 on this
4 report?

5 MR. CURTIS: Yes, and that's primarily
6 research. The analysis was a fair amount, but we
7 didn't -- the aerial photo interpretation is somewhat
8 focussed primarily on ordinance and explosive and it was
9 done fairly -- I don't want to say cheaply -- but we
10 didn't put as much effort on that. We were focussed
11 mostly on looking through smelly boxes of information.

12 MS. TRIGIANI: It's essential -- it's a team
13 that was under your direction as opposed to going to --
14 putting an A.P.B. out to every area that holds records
15 and saying, "What do you have on the Presidio?"

16 MR. CURTIS: It's a joke in our office. It's
17 like going, "Yeah," if we call somebody, "we already
18 know."

19 It's like, "Yeah, yeah, I looked through those
20 boxes. We don't have anything."

21 I mean, because we're a nuisance. When we show up
22 to these places we are a nuisance to the people that are
23 there. We are making them work very hard bringing us
24 information. We try to be very nice to them, but we are
25 making them work a lot harder. Their day would be a lot

1 They'll just send you off on a wild goose chase.

2 I don't want to discredit anybody. I mean there
3 are some people that have very sharp minds, but it has
4 to be a fairly regimented regime to figure out how much
5 they really know and make sure that what they're
6 saying -- the quality of the information is coming in.
7 So no, we didn't make that effort.

8 Primarily, the people we'd be looking for aren't
9 the people that were here in the last 20, 30 years.
10 They would be the people that were here in the '40s and
11 '50s. That's a lot harder to track down.

12 MS. CLEEK: I have a question on the
13 decontamination training. Is there like a standardized
14 process that they went through? What did they use? How
15 did they decided that they had really decontaminated
16 everything?

17 MR. CURTIS: Yeah, there is a standardized
18 process. There's what they -- standard technical
19 manuals. We have a lot of these historical technical
20 manuals saying, this is how you do this, this is how
21 it's supposed to work.

22 They have like -- think of it as like pH paper.
23 Remember from science class where you could test the pH
24 of your tongue or something like that? So it's kind of
25 like that, that they're kind of testing it. And if it

1 turns colors then it's -- I'm not sure if it turns
2 colors if it is contaminated or not contaminated or
3 what.

4 MS. CLEEK: So are they sampling, is that how
5 they --

6 MR. CURTIS: It's kind of like a sampling of
7 the areas that they've been through. And how they're
8 decontaminating it is they've got -- I don't know if you
9 remember those old, metal bug sprayer things and
10 spraying things down, that's kind of what the gadgets
11 look that, from what I've seen.

12 MS. CLEEK: I'm wondering if they left
13 something behind while they were decontaminating.

14 MR. COOPER: Just bleach.

15 MS. CLEEK: So mustard is neutralized just by
16 bleach?

17 MR. CURTIS: It's a special type of bleach.
18 I'm not sure of the chemistry. I would defer it to
19 people who actually studied the chemistry to answer that
20 question. But that's my understanding.

21 MR. HANDEL: That's what is used for
22 decontaminating equipment at Dugway Proving Ground;
23 bleach and water.

24 MS. CLEEK: I just sort of expected it to
25 require something more chemical than that.

1 As many of you know, during a -- I guess it was a
2 project by a student over at Berkeley, additional
3 contamination was found in the lake that was further
4 investigated, and it appears that there is some
5 hazardous levels of metals and pesticides in Mountain
6 Lake. That's been determined factually.

7 It also appears to many of us that the process --
8 I've kind of been corrected a little bit in my
9 terminology. Instead of delayed, we can say it's been
10 jeopardized in terms of its progress, due to a variety
11 of difficult challenges. That's the wording in the
12 resolution.

13 We're basically having some difficulty getting
14 Caltrans to come to the table and be part of the
15 discussion, and so we have created this resolution to
16 highlight some of our thoughts and to alert various
17 agencies that we're beginning a process of community
18 action and involvement with respect to Mountain Lake.

19 Why don't I give everybody a minute or two to read
20 this and then we can talk about it.

21 MR. LUIKART: Paragraph 3, we say "has been"
22 and "may be". Is "may" the strongest we're going to get
23 there, instead of "will"?

24 MR. KERN: I see your point. I mean, there is
25 a very high likelihood that there could be, without any

1 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Bleach is not innocent.

2 MS. CLEEK: No. I agree. But I was thinking
3 of something much more exotic.

4 MR. KERN: Well, I'd like to thank Randy and
5 Bruce. Thanks very much for coming out here and
6 answering questions. Great presentation.

7 MR. COOPER: Very thorough.

8 MR. KERN: We look forward to your
9 recommendations coming back and hearing about the
10 comprehensive cleanup of Baker Beach. I shouldn't have
11 said that. All right. Thanks.

12 I think we need a little break at this point, and
13 we'll reconvene at 9:00 o'clock. About 10 minutes.

14 (Break.)

15 MR. KERN: Let's get started. Our next item is
16 5B. Mountain Lake. We've had discussion. We have a
17 resolution we've been working on and we've gotten a few
18 other little comments that I've added in. They're
19 nothing substantial in the terms of the language.
20 They're some wordsmithing items. So take a look, and
21 I'll give a little background about what this is.

22 The Mountain Lake area has been an area of keen
23 interest for residents in the area, neighbors. There's
24 a Mountain Lake Association. There's been a great
25 amount of restoration going on there.

1 changes to the roadway structure, that there would be
2 ongoing contamination.

3 MR. BOGGS: Just as a matter of point, cars
4 driving down that road, when they emit toxic materials,
5 oftentimes it's a fine particle. That particle could be
6 blowing, never touching the ground over into Mountain
7 Lake.

8 Some of that -- this is part of Caltrans' argument
9 is if there's a truck driving down the road and it
10 spills a drum of toxic materials that runs off, Caltrans
11 is not responsible. It's the truck driver. Caltrans
12 says they never dumped anything on Highway 1. They
13 never released anything. It's all the drivers that were
14 on Highway 1 that are responsible because they
15 contributed the toxic materials.

16 MR. LUIKART: But we're not addressing Caltrans
17 in this paragraph. We're just saying it will or may
18 have future contamination because of the proximity to
19 the highway. It has nothing to do with Caltrans or the
20 drivers. We're just saying it's there and it happens.

21 MR. BOGGS: In most likely -- well, most likely
22 it will release materials, but if that constitutes --
23 it's not going to be the same materials that are
24 deposited there now in the levels that they are
25 deposited now; i.e., we're not going to have lead

1 hazardous waste levels. In all the studies that they
2 did, shows that that level of lead is actually a foot
3 down below the surface of the sediments in the lake.

4 So I think what we found about the actual surface
5 of the sediments of the lake at the current time is well
6 below the levels that are going to be actionable. It's
7 that layer that's one foot down that does require
8 action.

9 So "may" is probably the better word because we
10 don't know if it's going to actually exceed any
11 standards or not.

12 MR. KERN: It's possible, though, that if there
13 were some sort of a spill or wreck and barrels just
14 drained into the lake -- I mean that's another thing
15 that we've been talking about that should be corrected,
16 that gross contamination to the lake.

17 Are you suggesting that we change that "may" to
18 "will"? Is there a strong feeling?

19 MR. LUIKART: I'm not even suggesting that it's
20 Caltrans' responsibility or not. I'm just saying it's
21 near a major highway, every November it rains, and the
22 runoff does go to the lake, and the runoff does contain
23 contaminants. There's no doubt about it.

24 So "it has," that's the definitive; and "will"
25 would be the future definitive of "has." That's all.

1 MR. LUIKART: We're not laying the blame on
2 anyone in this paragraph. We're just saying it's going
3 to happen.

4 MR. HULTGREN: It's a fact. We know that
5 there's going to be more pollution coming from the
6 highway unless something is done about it.

7 I mean, what do you need to convince you about it?
8 I mean even if they've changed the type of gasoline,
9 there's still all the gas and tires and everything else
10 that is going to run off from the highway into the lake.
11 Period. That's all toxic.

12 MR. BOGGS: So you can't change the storm
13 drains, and if they do, we'll still get contaminants.

14 MR. HULTGREN: Well, I don't care. We don't
15 care about that. We're just saying it's there. We're
16 not saying who did it or what to do about it.

17 MR. BOGGS: Well, no, we were talking -- just
18 when we were talking about "may" or "will be" future.
19 We're talking about future. Caltrans does go re-route
20 their storm drains per a request. It changes it back --
21 well, it doesn't necessarily change it back to "may";
22 i.e., we know that there's blow off from exhaust and
23 that kind of stuff, that the dust would just blow over,
24 regardless if the storm drains are there or not,
25 draining into the lake. So "will" is perfectly fine.

1 It's not "may."

2 MS. CHEEVER: But isn't Bob saying that the
3 current runoff actually has less contamination because
4 of changes in regulations about additives to --

5 MR. BOGGS: Right. We don't have leaded gas
6 anymore, which is -- lead is a primary contaminant in
7 Mountain Lake. And so what we found is lead that is
8 right at the surface of the sediments is far, far, far
9 lower than what's (INAUDIBLE).

10 But he is right, there will be contaminants
11 released in the lake. Whether they're high enough to
12 really cause an action though, that's a different
13 question. But I think it would be very hard to prevent
14 some sort of contaminants from getting into the lake.

15 MS. TRIGIANI: In the fifth paragraph --

16 MR. HULTGREN: Can we act on that first to get
17 it out of the way. I'm sorry, I'm not criticizing you,
18 I'm just saying let's be orderly about this and decide
19 what to do about it.

20 MS. YAROS: I'm okay with the word "may," but I
21 suppose an alternative would be "will most likely in the
22 future."

23 MR. HULTGREN: I think "will" is an excellent
24 word. I think anything else is just kind of being
25 weaselly.

1 MR. KERN: Is there any objection to change it
2 to "will"?

3 MR. BERMAN: Well, it's just that the sentence
4 is actually complicated because it starts with, "There's
5 sufficient evidence to conclude."

6 Okay. The question is: Do you really mean that,
7 for the second part of the sentence, is there sufficient
8 evidence to conclude that there will be future
9 contamination?

10 MR. ANDERSON: Sure. It just doesn't say how
11 much.

12 MR. BERMAN: Yes, okay. Because if that's what
13 you want to say, that you're confident now that there's
14 sufficient evidence to conclude that there will be
15 future contamination, then, you know, it's just a
16 question of whether --

17 MR. KERN: Any objection to "will"?

18 Next point. Mary.

19 MS. TRIGIANI: Fifth paragraph, second line. I
20 would suggest in the -- to pick up on Julian's word, in
21 the spirit of non-weaseling -- understand that it is
22 time to move, instead of saying the timing is right.
23 This is strictly, like, you know, language stuff.

24 MR. LUIKART: It's wordsmithing. It's a more
25 definitive way of --

1 MS. TRIGIANI: Yeah. And then "mobilizing
2 public support," I would say public action or public
3 interest.

4 MR. KERN: Any objection to the word "action"
5 in there for support?

6 MR. BERMAN: I think that's a good one, because
7 support is a kind of vague term. In a sense, action is
8 a little bit stronger. But I think the rest of it --
9 the timing is right. I don't know if that's a weasel to
10 say that the timing is right. That's -- you get down to
11 what you read into words.

12 MS. TRIGIANI: It is time.

13 MR. KERN: I don't mind "it is time to move the
14 project forward." Is there any objection to that?

15 Okay. Any other items? Jerry.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Well, as long as we're talking
17 about individual words, in the last two paragraphs, it
18 says "at the appropriate time." I would suggest "an
19 appropriate time," otherwise it sounds like you have a
20 specific time in mind but you're just not telling him
21 what it is.

22 MR. KERN: I don't mind "an appropriate time."
23 Okay. That's good.

24 And for the final paragraph? Yes. Michelle.

25 MS. PASSERO: Paragraph 7. I'm not sure if

1 local community groups" kind of looked left out from the
2 page a bit. Does that mean we're saying we're going to
3 organize, like create local community groups, or maybe
4 does this mean work with local community groups, which
5 is a little more less domineering?

6 MR. KERN: It certainly means more to work
7 with.

8 MS. CHEEVER: I would suggest either -- instead
9 of to work with local community groups, or else inform
10 and work with local community groups. Just a thought.

11 MR. KERN: To inform and work with, instead of
12 organize. Any objection?

13 All right. Jack.

14 MR. LUIKART: I was going to move that we
15 approve this.

16 MR. KERN: Any other clarifying comments?

17 MR. BERMAN: I guess in view of the making the
18 change in the next to the last paragraph about including
19 future actions about -- I don't remember the exact
20 words, but in the final paragraph, again, they're voting
21 just for the securing funding for the --

22 MR. KERN: Right.

23 MR. BERMAN: -- cleanup. So the question is if
24 you're going to make that consistent, you should maybe
25 change it in both paragraphs.

1 this was in other people's thoughts as well, but it
2 seems like legislation could -- certainly you could try
3 to secure funding or direct funding, but the other piece
4 of that may be to help either prevent or mitigate future
5 contamination. So getting something to the legislation
6 that helps with construction in the roadway, or that
7 helps to mitigate.

8 So including the prospect of, say, legislation, to
9 mitigate future contamination. I guess -- is it
10 impossible to prevent it -- so to mitigate and to secure
11 funding from responsible parties.

12 MR. KERN: Any objection to that addition?

13 Lou.

14 MR. LUIKART: Could you repeat it.

15 MR. KERN: Yes. It goes: "Be it further
16 resolved that the community members of the Presidio RAB
17 will at an appropriate time in the near future encourage
18 its individual members to inform and organize local
19 community groups for completion of the project,
20 including the prospect of State legislation to mitigate
21 future contamination and to secure funding from
22 responsible parties for the cleanup of Mountain Lake."

23 MS. CHEEVER: I haven't been following this
24 maybe as closely as some people. Perhaps I'm looking at
25 it with different eyes. But the "inform and organize

1 MR. KERN: Right. I agree. "In order to
2 promote State legislation for the purposes of mitigating
3 future contamination and securing funding from
4 responsible parties."

5 MS. CHEEVER: One other thing. Maybe I didn't
6 hear right. But if we're changing to "an appropriate
7 time" in the second to last paragraph, don't we want to
8 make that -- did you already do that for both?

9 MR. KERN: Yes.

10 MR. SUTTER: I move that we adopt the
11 resolution with the changes that have been made.

12 MR. LUIKART: Second.

13 MR. KERN: Is there any discussions? It's been
14 moved and seconded that we adopt the resolution as
15 amended. All the community members, if you could please
16 raise your hand and we'll count those in favor.
17 Eighteen. Opposed? Seeing none. So the resolution
18 passes with 18 in favor to zero.

19 Thank you very much for the participation in
20 crafting this. We'll begin the next steps probably at
21 the next committee meeting discussing our various
22 strategies of how we want to pursue this.

23 Thank you very much for this. I think it gives us
24 a nice starting place on where to move from here.

25 Now we are at Item 5C, project status update.

1 Craig.

2 MR. COOPER: Okay. This is your monthly
3 status. It has been updated to all of the major
4 remediation sites. Again, it's already 9:30. I'm going
5 to talk really fast and stop me if you have any
6 questions.

7 So, once again, on the Trust Feasibility Study,
8 it's reported, you know, it's been made publicly
9 available. I've got a letter from the RAB. I have just
10 been waylaid with some other things. I have a draft
11 response letter ready, but I haven't been able to finish
12 that yet to sent to Brian. So I apologize for the
13 delay. I hope this slide changes by November.

14 Five-Year Report, out by the end of November;
15 that's for Landfills 8 and 10 at the (INAUDIBLE).

16 Landfill E. The data report from the work we did
17 last year is out. As we've announced, CH2MHill is our
18 future Trust new environmental consultant for Landfill
19 E, and they're looking at all site data and background
20 information. We hope to have a kickoff meeting and
21 bring the project manager and the program manager from
22 CH2MHill to the next RAB Committee meeting on
23 October 28th and kind of do a little meet-and-greet and
24 introduce the folks and let them meet you all. So I'll
25 talk to Mark if whether that's an acceptable agenda for

1 pesticide data in the sediments. It's not very
2 thorough, so we need to kind of nail that down a little
3 bit. And we'll -- we're going to take some hazardous
4 waste -- it's federal and state hazardous waste, that's
5 the TCLP and TLC test so we can better characterize our
6 off-site disposal cost.

7 Nike Swale. We have a sample plan with DTSC, and
8 we hope to implement it very soon, because this
9 particular site is in the RAP for next year. The RAP
10 for this year, as you know, the public comment period
11 ended and I'm working on a responsiveness summary.
12 That's the written response to each and every comment
13 that was received during the public comment period.

14 So it's just like the same thing we did last year.
15 I'll send that over to Bob and he'll look at it. If
16 he's satisfied that we've responded to all the comments,
17 then we'll prepare a final RAP and then send that over
18 to DTSC for signature.

19 Let's see here. So while we're finalizing the RAP,
20 we have to keep moving forward with the remedial designs
21 for the sites in this RAP. And, as you know, we are
22 hoping to get this done this year so we could have dug
23 out Baker Beach 3 this year, and before the rains. And
24 as you know, we didn't make it.

25 That was disappointing for me, and despite our best

1 you guys at the October -- or you can maybe decide
2 today.

3 MR. YOUNGKIN: It's on the agenda.

4 MR. COOPER: Firing ranges. As you know, we
5 had an RFS work plan go out and take a whole bunch of
6 samples at small arms firing ranges. There was a couple
7 places where a couple of firing ranges where we need to
8 take some more samples to complete our delineation, so
9 we'll be doing a presentation on how we're going to
10 present the findings and present our points on where we
11 need to take more samples. Because we need to send that
12 to Bob and get his okay before we go out and take some
13 more samples.

14 Mountain Lake, which we've been talking about for a
15 while. Our preredial design continues. I've been
16 talking about the importance of that and now it looks
17 like I have a deadline, six months from today, to finish
18 our preliminary design work.

19 We've been talking a lot internally with our
20 natural resources staff over the last month or so to
21 figure out the best way to work out some logistics in
22 cleaning up the sediments. I think we've announced
23 before we're going to be getting a sample and analysis
24 plan to Bob and Jim regarding better delineating the
25 pesticide hits. As you know, there's a little bit of

1 efforts, we didn't make the rainy season deadline. But
2 we still are going -- we're still proceeding full-steam
3 ahead. We're going to send the design package to DTSC
4 and -- for Baker Beach 3 and 4 this week.

5 We also have a test pit plan at Baker Beach 3. We
6 wanted to dig in to Baker Beach 3 and do a little
7 characterization test. And Bob is looking at that right
8 now. We're also looking at pushing forward with our
9 design work for Fill Site 6A.

10 Again, we wanted to actually implement those
11 remedies this year. They're being pushed to the very
12 early part of 2004. So we've had to redo our schedule
13 to recount for that.

14 Okay. So this is the next RAP. This is next
15 year's RAP that I was talking about. I've talked about
16 that before. It includes a whole bunch of sites. I
17 think 25 sites or more.

18 We, as you know, the Trust collected some data at
19 Baker Beach 1 and 2 sites to better delineate the
20 contamination there, and so we have an Interim Data
21 Report that we're looking at and we'll be releasing that
22 to the public shortly.

23 Then Mactec, who was our contractor for this big
24 RAP for next year, is working on the RAP and the
25 remedial designs and the remedies included in that RAP.

1 So stay tuned. That's a big, big project.
 2 On our petroleum side, we have the interim action
 3 at Building 1065. We've selected our contractor. It's
 4 Performance Excavators. We use them I believe to do the
 5 Crissy Field Skeet Range cleanup and they did a good job
 6 there. So we hope, now that our oracle procurement
 7 system is going again internally at the Presidio Trust,
 8 we can send one last purchase order over to Performance
 9 Excavators. And we hope to get started by the end of
 10 October. Hopefully. It's hard being the last week of
 11 October. It might slip to the first week of November.
 12 We also are going to be sending out an Email kind
 13 of flyer to the tenants that are in that area. Just
 14 give them a heads up on what's going on. There's going
 15 to be some road closures and the parking lots are going
 16 to be temporarily closed for a while. Basically putting
 17 the word out on that.
 18 I'm also, on November 5th, speaking to the mayor --
 19 Presidio Mayor's Council and I'm going to be talking
 20 about this project. Because right around November 5th
 21 the project should just be getting started.
 22 The Email notification -- actually, I think it's
 23 going to be a flyer that's going to be mailed to the
 24 tenants in this area -- they should have that by the end
 25 of this week. So if any questions come up in that flyer

1 I'll be able to answer them, either by telephone call or
 2 personally on November 5th at the Mayor's meeting.
 3 Okay. Another petroleum project is 207/231. It's
 4 still in the work plan, data collection stage. We're
 5 working with the regulators right now.
 6 1349. What we believe is from finished collecting
 7 data, we are -- Trust and the National Park Service is
 8 looking at it, the data report, and will be releasing
 9 that to the regulators. There's some soil sampling
 10 along the FDS line there. I don't know what that is.
 11 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's not part of 1349.
 12 (INAUDIBLE) so near where the FDS line formally was.
 13 MR. COOPER: Down at which project?
 14 MR. ULLENSVANG: (INAUDIBLE) FDS line work. It
 15 was just a discovery (INAUDIBLE).
 16 MR. COOPER: So that's just a heads up on the
 17 FDS line in general. That happens periodically just
 18 from Trust trench work. When the utility lines go in,
 19 occasionally they'll be crisscrossing where the former
 20 FDS line was.
 21 Groundwater monitoring program. Under our new
 22 order from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, we
 23 send out reports now semiannually. We still monitor
 24 quarterly, but the written reports go out semiannually.
 25 And so Q1 and Q2 is combined. It's a single report

1 that's due to Jim on October 15th. And I'm to meet the
 2 deadline, which is tomorrow.
 3 What we talked about. Bruce Handel mentioned that
 4 the soil that had been stockpiled at Inspiration Point
 5 was sorted by Army contractors, and they didn't find any
 6 mustard agent bottles in that soil, so that soil has now
 7 been removed from the site. Thank goodness. That's one
 8 step in the right direction.
 9 We had Bruce Handel's contractor -- not
 10 contractor -- I guess other division from the Corps of
 11 Engineers, come and discuss a very thorough Archive
 12 Search Report.
 13 These are the two things that we've released since
 14 our last RAB meeting that at least I can think of.
 15 We've sent out an important document called "DEH
 16 Operable Unit Final Closure and Request for DTSC
 17 Certification." That's dated September 30th.
 18 That's like the -- we had to draft one to the
 19 regulators last year. They had some comments on that.
 20 We think that we've rewritten the report in a manner
 21 that addressed the regulator's comments. So that has
 22 now been resubmitted to them.
 23 The other one is that -- oh, I meant to put that
 24 that's an Army -- the second bullet is not a Trust
 25 document. That's the Army's final work plan to do their

1 soil sifting at the mustard agent sites. That's it.
 2 MR. KERN: Any questions for Craig?
 3 MR. BERMAN: On the agenda there was something
 4 called "budget and schedule update."
 5 MR. COOPER: Oh yeah. So I wrote a letter
 6 saying that I had a procurement request in oracle, which
 7 is our accounting system to process procurements --
 8 because I wanted to hire someone to help us kind of take
 9 our budget and cost tracking to the next tier of
 10 sophistication, basically.
 11 I think I announced at the last RAB meeting, or was
 12 it a committee meeting -- I forget -- that it got --
 13 that procurement got vetoed basically, and I was told
 14 that it would be better for us -- that the accounting
 15 department said that they could provide those services
 16 in house.
 17 So George and I met with a couple folks from the
 18 accounting department, just in mid-September, and they
 19 said -- you know, they kind of interviewed us and they
 20 said these are our needs. And we kind of went over the
 21 scope of work that we had put together for the
 22 procurement request just so they better understood it.
 23 They said, "Yeah, we feel confident that we can do
 24 this in-house, and we'll get back to you."
 25 So then it's been -- you know, the end of the

1 fiscal year is September 30th, so the Accounting
2 Department has been busy closing their books and
3 reopening the books for now fiscal year '04.

4 So now that -- I'm going to give them like another
5 week and then I'm going to say, "Okay, remember me? You
6 said that we can work something out as far as obtaining
7 our needs for a more sophisticated cost tracking system
8 for the remediation program."

9 So I've been kind of giving them a break the last
10 couple of weeks due to that kind of
11 end-of-the-fiscal-year push. So let's see how that
12 goes.

13 Whether we're actually going to be able to do this
14 cost tracking system the way we want it by using Trust
15 in-house staff, you know, I'm a little pessimistic that
16 that's going to be -- that they're going to be able to
17 do that. But hopefully we'll be able to resolve this
18 soon.

19 If they're able to do it, then great. I hope they
20 can assign someone to this project quickly. If they're
21 not able to do it with in-house staff, then we'll go
22 back to our procurement request and hire somebody.

23 MS. TRIGIANI: Craig, two things. I would
24 appreciate it, whatever we have to do, if everyone
25 agrees on this, but I would suggest that you make it

1 maintain it. They will be in charge of it. Therefore
2 it won't be a turf battle because it will be theirs to
3 own.

4 I think you just have to approach them on the basis
5 of getting something on a jump-start basis so that it
6 gets the ball rolling so that it can then be theirs to
7 own.

8 So in two weeks we hope you report back to our
9 committee you've won them over.

10 MR. COOPER: Okay.

11 MR. KERN: Craig, were there any other follow
12 up on that item?

13 I had a few comments on the other report. On the
14 Public Health Service Hospital Five-Year Review, is that
15 basically referring to Landfill 8 and 10 and Graded Area
16 9?

17 MR. COOPER: Just 8 and 10. Graded Area 9 is
18 in the Main Installation Operable Unit.

19 MR. KERN: So Landfill 8 and 10, there actually
20 has been some data out for a while? I mean, I guess my
21 question about this is, it says it's scheduled for
22 release; do we know why it's being held up, or is the
23 data still being validated, or what kind of issues are
24 there?

25 MR. COOPER: I think the data has been

1 clear to them that when they say they can handle your
2 needs, they can handle your needs whether it's the
3 closing of the fiscal year, the opening of the fiscal
4 year, or the run across the Golden Gate Bridge. I mean,
5 I just really think that's obnoxious.

6 Secondly, I understand that politically -- and I
7 hope this is all getting recorded -- that politically
8 you have to give these folks a shot, but I suggest that
9 the environmental team give them a complete deadline.
10 And if your needs are not being met and our needs are
11 not being met, then the procurement needs to become a
12 live issue again.

13 Because I find this just really appalling. After
14 all the work that you and your team have done and all
15 the suggestions that we've made that they can't be more
16 responsive than this is really unprofessional. Thank
17 you.

18 MR. LUIKART: I think this could be put in a
19 less offensive, I guess, manner. Not referring to your
20 comments, but referring to just the dilemma. A less
21 offensive manner to say that you need a procurement for
22 an individual who's going to jump start the project,
23 who's going to be on your premises for a period of three
24 to six months, and at that point in time it's going to
25 be turned over to the Accounting Department. They will

1 validated. I think we reported on this before, and the
2 first draft of the report was in very poor quality and
3 it had an incredible amount of errors in it. And so we
4 had to do a significant rewrite of that.

5 And now the second one -- I think we might be on
6 the third round at this point. So that's the problem,
7 that we just don't want to issue a real crappy report.

8 I think I've already given you an idea that there
9 are going to be further actions most likely necessary at
10 both landfills.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: It may help to remind people,
12 because it's been a while. This is a report of the
13 field work that was done last fall and winter. There
14 was some well installation, trenches, borings, water and
15 some other things.

16 MR. KERN: Right. I guess partly the reason
17 why I'm asking a little bit about that is it's been a
18 long process, and it sometimes has been helpful with
19 this group to kind of talk about what's going to come
20 out. And it seems like it has been known what you want
21 to do. But I still don't feel like I know what it is
22 that you're going to do.

23 MR. COOPER: Oh, I don't think it's known what
24 we're going to do.

25 MR. KERN: Okay. Well, that's good news then,

1 because it's not really clear what's -- what's happening
2 there.

3 Just one other thing that kind of complicates this
4 is there's a lot of other discussion in the community
5 about the Landfill 8 and 10 Area Public Hospital Service
6 site, and so like we're experiencing, perhaps, with
7 Tennessee Hollow and certain delays and issues, it would
8 be nice to maybe understand some of the issues there at
9 some point that you're considering.

10 MR. COOPER: Right. Yeah, as soon as we get
11 this report out, we're going to -- again, we'll talk
12 about the findings of the report. But then the findings
13 of the report don't discuss what should happen next. I
14 think I've already slipped out that we do think there is
15 actionable contamination at both landfills, that
16 something more needs to be done. We have not decided
17 what that extra step is.

18 I don't want to get ahead of myself with the
19 regulators. I mean, I've got a couple of ideas, but
20 you've got to really follow the process. I've got to
21 get them the report and get the data in their hands
22 before I start talking to you all about what I think is
23 the right -- next steps are. And so that's the -- there
24 are (INAUDIBLE) on that one. We really want to get the
25 report out soon.

1 right track. I think that's a lesson learned that we're
2 trying to do with all of our contractors now is ask for
3 annotated outlines of your report before you start
4 putting pen to paper on things. We're trying to be a
5 lot more thoughtful in getting things in advance to make
6 sure that we know that they're on the right track.

7 But even doing this, you can only carry that so
8 far, and then you do have to cut them loose and let them
9 write the report. Unfortunately, on this one, their
10 first shot, it was assigned to someone at this
11 particular consulting company that just didn't do a very
12 good job.

13 The way our contracts are set up is that we have
14 to -- at this point, you have to basically -- it's
15 always best to kind of stick with it and get the report
16 out. Then if we -- we can maybe later decide this a
17 contract we want to keep. Because contractors, really
18 what they're really looking for is they're looking to
19 keep this project so they can work on the next step.

20 That's our -- kind of our stick against contractors
21 is ones that are good performers continue to get work;
22 ones that are poor performers, they won't get work in
23 the future.

24 MS. CHEEVER: Are you paying them by their time
25 or a lump sum?

1 MS. CHEEVER: Can I add to what Doug said?
2 Because, specifically, environmental scoping comments
3 for the environmental assessment for the Public Health
4 Service Hospital Development project are due
5 November 26th, and one of the things that people like us
6 on the RAB or -- in fact, perhaps one of our
7 responsibilities is to bring our knowledge of the
8 cleanup to the environmental scoping process. I guess
9 the same thing applies to the very same scoping process
10 going forth in Tennessee Hollow. And even if that
11 report doesn't have recommendations of what to do, it
12 would be helpful to have the information in it to bring
13 it to the environmental scoping. It's very good to have
14 all these projects cross connect.

15 Secondly, just as someone watching the RAB and all
16 your efforts to try to get good contractors and so on,
17 I'm saddened to hear that you say that this report was
18 full of flaws. Was this a contractor who's wasting
19 precious money by doing a flawed report, and is there
20 something that can be done about that? I know you tried
21 very hard to watch for that, but what happened?

22 MR. COOPER: Well, we try our best to track
23 their progress through interim deliverables.
24 Unfortunately, this one, I don't know if we actually did
25 ask for an interim deliverable that they were on the

1 MR. COOPER: It is -- well, it's a lump sum for
2 a particular scope of work.

3 MS. CHEEVER: So if they have to rewrite it,
4 they're paying for the cost of rewriting it, not you.
5 Or are you paying for the cost of rewriting it?

6 MR. COOPER: We're paying for the cost of
7 rewriting it.

8 MS. CHEEVER: Goodness. Well, maybe, just
9 looking in the future you could think of ways to do
10 future contracts to preserve yourself, I guess.

11 MR. KERN: Did you have a comment?

12 MR. SUTTER: Yeah. Regarding the budget and
13 schedule update. I think at the last committee meeting
14 I had asked Craig if the Trust could make a formal
15 schedule presentation to the RAB, or in the near future.
16 I'd like to suggest that maybe, if possible, we do that
17 at the next committee meeting.

18 MR. COOPER: A schedule update?

19 MR. SUTTER: Yes. A schedule, and what I'd
20 like to see is a variance report that indicates from the
21 last schedule that was issued to the RAB, I think that
22 was six to eight months ago, and the current master
23 schedule, what has been the variances on individual, the
24 overall schedule and individual funding schedules and
25 the reason for that.

1 MR. COOPER: Okay. That's quite doable. On
2 the budget part, before, we had that little Excel
3 spreadsheet that George had been working on. I haven't
4 been updating that in hopes the cost tracker was going
5 to kind of take it from there. So I'm assuming that's
6 all right with everybody for the time being. I guess it
7 depends on how long it's getting delayed.

8 But that's how we'll -- so you won't see -- I can
9 tell you that -- in fact, I just did a -- every quarter
10 we do add up our expenditures. We talked about that
11 with the Zurich. So I do know how much we spend each
12 quarter.

13 Last quarter we spent about \$2 million. So I can
14 kind of give you a -- if you want just kind of gross
15 figures. If you're worried that we might be spending
16 way, way out of control, I can give you some total
17 expenditures by quarter, something in the interim.

18 Tell me if you are, because it might be a while
19 until we get a much more sophisticated cost report from
20 our new cost tracker.

21 MS. BLUM: I would love to see one of those for
22 my own reference, as you describe it. What I'd like to
23 see, Craig, in addition to what we spent last quarter is
24 what did we anticipate -- based on the last report that
25 we got from George, that spreadsheet -- what did we

1 yeah, I'll do a report. I guess if you guys want it at
2 the committee meeting or the next RAB meeting -- because
3 I did mention that we missed our construction start for
4 Baker Beach 3, in particular, this year -- we can talk
5 about that and the reasons why and we can talk about the
6 schedule in general.

7 When I issued the schedule in the very beginning --
8 it's an extremely aggressive schedule, and we're doing
9 everything we can to keep on schedule for these
10 projects, but it's not easy.

11 MR. KERN: There are a few more questions that
12 I had on that, but I think I'm going to have to defer
13 those to the committee meeting. So if everyone will
14 allow me to move the agenda, I think we just have a few
15 more minutes tonight, I'm going to give Bob and Jim some
16 time, if they had some items.

17 MR. BOGGS: I was just going to add one thing
18 that seems to be of importance is there's actually an
19 upper management meeting at DTSC next Friday at
20 10:00 o'clock to discuss Mountain Lake. So word of your
21 resolution has prompted action by my department.

22 MR. PONTON: Building on that -- actually, I
23 think it was September 10th -- I'm working with the
24 NPDES people, and they had a meeting with Caltrans at
25 work and I have feedback from that meeting. We had

1 anticipate we would have spent by X amount of time and
2 what have we -- I don't know if you can do that or not.

3 What I really wanted to say is, what was the
4 estimate that we had thought we were going to spend by
5 October 31st, 2004 versus what we actually spent? I
6 mean, just if you could keep it really simple. If you
7 can. If you can.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: You'd have to do it by project
9 because by time you wouldn't know if you're being above
10 or below budget because you wouldn't know if you were on
11 or off schedule.

12 MS. BLUM: Okay. But it's just looking at what
13 we spent by a quarter is really -- from my point of
14 view, really not a good reference number because it
15 doesn't tell you where you are. It just tells you where
16 you've been.

17 MR. COOPER: Right. That was my whole point.
18 We need cumulative amounts spent by project. George and
19 I had started that, and then it was getting more and
20 more time consuming.

21 Let me take a look and see what we can update,
22 without it taking up too much of George's time, just to
23 kind of show where we are by project. It might be
24 something we need to do anyway to show the cost tracker.

25 On the schedule -- I mean, Dave just left, but

1 someone from Caltrans who's on their staff now,
2 Mary Frederick. She's a senior manager. I'm not quite
3 sure what she does at the board, but she's a loan to us.

4 So I met with a guy called Dave Yim, who is an
5 engineer who worked in the retrofit for the Bay Bridge,
6 and I talked to Craig about whether or not it was wise
7 to talk to them about Mountain Lake and where we're at
8 with that.

9 So I met with them and they recommended that I
10 address a letter to Bijon Sartepee, which is like the
11 director of Region II of Caltrans, or of this region. I
12 think it's Region II. And I referenced the meetings
13 that DTSC had with them.

14 Basically, Mr. Yim agreed that it would make sense
15 to divorce the waters from the highway from entering the
16 lake. I didn't use the word divorce. I wrote a letter
17 that was put in the mailbox to go out about two weeks
18 ago. So I asked Craig if he had gotten it. He hasn't.
19 Brian hasn't gotten it. You were all cc'd.

20 It was asking that the Trust, the Park Service and
21 Caltrans get together on a technical level, without the
22 attorneys, at a technical level to talk about ways to
23 look at the progress that has been made to date, what
24 they would suggest in ways that -- rerouting the water
25 from 19th Avenue from the lake.

1 What that would mean is that it would go to the
2 POTW, who are the Publicly Owned Treatment Works, and
3 they really don't want to get more flow. But there are
4 ways that we can leverage. We can help them take on
5 that flow and -- by working with another program.

6 So I just wanted to let you know that there was a
7 letter out there that was written a few weeks ago that
8 should come out. It was -- I had probably a 20-minute
9 meeting with them. I talked to Craig about it. I read
10 him the letter. He's okay with it. That's about it.

11 So between your resolution and me in some meeting,
12 I think it really would just be valuable to have a
13 technical meeting without the threat of litigation.
14 What Bob described for next week, maybe some combination
15 of those three would move the project forward.

16 I'll track it down and see where it is. I can at
17 least E-mail it, but I'm concerned that it didn't go
18 out. It should have gone out.

19 MR. KERN: Thank you. Thanks for following up
20 on that.

21 We have about five minutes left in our meeting, so
22 I'll try to capture several of these items quickly. For
23 new business, reschedule the November RAB meeting for
24 November 18th.

25 Can you help me with what kind of a day we have?

1 So we're looking at the third Tuesday instead of
2 the second Tuesday.

3 MR. LUIKART: The first Tuesday is Veterans'
4 Day.

5 MS. CHEEVER: Is it definitely a holiday?

6 MR. COOPER: Tuesday, November 11th is
7 Veterans' Day.

8 MS. CHEEVER: And it's celebrated on Tuesday?

9 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah. It's not a Monday
10 holiday.

11 MR. KERN: So are we going to be able to make
12 that determination? Is that something that people can
13 do? I mean will there be enough of us there to have a
14 meeting on the third Tuesday instead of the second
15 Tuesday of next month? Show of hands. So we need to do
16 that then. So the third Tuesday, the 18th.

17 It's been proposed that we have a Landfill E
18 Focused Feasibility Study Kickoff meeting at our October
19 Planning Committee meeting. I don't really know what
20 that would involve, so -- and how much time that would
21 take. We're starting to pack in a lot of items.

22 I think we need to start to hear about what's --
23 what may be going on for that. So maybe we can talk
24 about what you guys want to put on or what you think we
25 might want to --

1 MR. COOPER: It's not going to have a lot of
2 detail. Basically bringing the CH2MHill people there,
3 just kind of remind people what they're tasks do during
4 this Focused Feasibility Study, what goes into a Focused
5 Feasibility Study. That's about it.

6 And then hearing from -- we've talked to Hill about
7 what RAB concerns are and things like that. But it was
8 just basically your opportunity to speak for yourselves
9 about landfill -- for them to hear what your opinion is.

10 MR. KERN: Well, this is just my reaction, but
11 I would want to make sure that we were very organized to
12 give our concerns to a group of consultants that you
13 were going to pay probably to be at this meeting, that
14 we would make really, really good use of that time.

15 So I'm not sure how to react to it. But I think we
16 could probably put something together to make some use
17 of that. So maybe we can do some Emailing around to
18 figure out what we want to do for that.

19 We'll have to get back to you obviously pretty
20 quickly.

21 MR. BERMAN: Just on that point, there was some
22 documents that were prepared in terms of the FS and
23 prior to that, which is a collection of thoughts of the
24 RAB, and if that's all available and can be compiled in
25 advance of the meeting and that material be given to the

1 Hill people, then they would have something to look at
2 beforehand, which I think is the best way to make use of
3 their time. You don't hit them with something at that
4 moment, but there's a collection of material. That way
5 we could maximize the communications.

6 MR. KERN: That's a great idea.

7 Action items. Well, I guess I should throw in one
8 piece of new business, if everyone will allow me one
9 minute to go 'til 10:00. I'm just struck very soundly
10 between the eyes about this Baker Beach being used as
11 firing range. It's not ever been on any list that I've
12 ever seen since I've been around here.

13 Unless somebody would correct me about -- I mean it
14 seems like we have a new site that has got a lot of
15 public access, and I'm personally concerned and I
16 can't -- I'm astounded that that presentation happened
17 like that. But that's just my personal reaction.

18 MR. BERMAN: Well, it's shared by others. I
19 mean, I was blown away by it myself. Because the whole
20 question of public safety there has never been
21 addressed.

22 MR. KERN: I'm not necessarily saying or
23 suggesting that there's an imminent hazard.

24 MR. BERMAN: Right.

25 MR. KERN: It certainly seems like there should

1 be some attention paid to that. So I think that needs
2 to be a fairly significant item on some agenda that we
3 have in the near future, perhaps at our next one.

4 MR. BERMAN: I know time has run out, but Brian
5 made a recommendation to Bruce about that, to get the
6 recommendations from the Huntsville people as soon as
7 possible. But would it be inappropriate for that to be
8 put in writing?

9 MS. TRIGIANI: From us or from --

10 MR. BERMAN: No, from Brian. Brian had made
11 the request.

12 MR. ULLENSVANG: I can certainly make a
13 request. Sure.

14 MR. BOGGS: My agency can make it as well,
15 because it could become a certain priority too, as well.

16 MR. KERN: For my agency as well.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: Yeah. I believe that you
18 would probably have more force with those requests,
19 though we'd be happy to make that request. If you can
20 do that.

21 MR. BOGGS: Yes.

22 MS. CHEEVER: Is firing range the right word or
23 could it be broader things if the contamination --

24 MR. KERN: It could be a whole lot of things.
25 I mean, I just saw the explosion on the beach. That was

1 what you think might most pressing.

2 MR. COOPER: It's going -- it's a public
3 document. I'm assuming it's going to be on a CD and
4 that we can make it available to the RAB.

5 MR. ULLENSVANG: I didn't assume it was going
6 to be on a CD. I think it will a paper report. There
7 will be some time line to get it reproduced.

8 MR. BOGGS: Is he calling it final or draft?

9 MR. YOUNGKIN: It's a final on the slide.

10 MR. BOGGS: Right. That's what I thought. So
11 at some point, if it is released as a final copy it
12 becomes public.

13 MR. COOPER: Right. Archives like his data
14 dump findings.

15 MR. KERN: It just seems to me that the very
16 moment that that became available to us, it's -- that is
17 such a high-use area that it's our obligation to make
18 sure that somebody is on top of that situation. I mean,
19 there's probably a low probability that there's an
20 issue, but that's not up to us.

21 MR. BERMAN: Right. But that's the purpose of
22 the letter.

23 MR. KERN: Right.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think it's important to know
25 the Park Service has procedures to (INAUDIBLE) for it

1 the picture.

2 MS. CHEEVER: Is there more information out
3 that's in a report, I think, that you guys have or not?
4 Or do you have a report?

5 MR. COOPER: I don't have it. He said he was
6 going to mail it to me by the end of this week, or he
7 was going to mail it to Bob.

8 MR. ULLENSVANG: He was going to mail it to you
9 and Bob tomorrow, and he would expect he would have it
10 by Thursday or Friday.

11 MS. CHEEVER: Would that have information about
12 the dates or the type of exercises that went on at Baker
13 Beach?

14 MR. ULLENSVANG: I talked with Randy during the
15 break. The report is apparently about this thick. It
16 does seem to be quite thorough. Bruce said that the
17 actual substance of the report is about this thick. So
18 I suspect that within that there's quite a bit of
19 information. Much more detail with time periods and
20 events than the overview he shared tonight.

21 So I think it is important for, at least some of
22 us, to read that report.

23 MS. CHEEVER: It seems like a prime topic for
24 our committee meeting. That those of you, maybe the
25 regulators who have read it, could tell us more about

1 and this could be an ordinance discovery if there was a
2 projectile or some sort of canister that was found
3 there. It gets reported to our emergency dispatch, 911,
4 and then it triggers a whole reaction to -- as it does
5 to Trust, who also has a very similar procedures -- to
6 guard public safety in the event of discovery. And that
7 has happened elsewhere in Presidio and GGNRA. Not for
8 chemical weapons necessarily, but for commission
9 ordinance.

10 MR. COOPER: Right.

11 MS. BLUM: I would just like to add for the
12 record that we might want to talk about ways we could --
13 once the report has been viewed by the folks that know
14 what they're reading, that we have, perhaps -- instead
15 of getting caught up in -- excuse me -- governmental
16 time lines, that we think of additional strategies to
17 escalate the issue rapidly so we didn't get locked into
18 like six-month or a year or year-and-a-half kind of
19 process, that that would be part of the consideration,
20 that we would get some help immediately to raise the
21 issue up in light of the fact that these people are so
22 overcommitted already and they're a war zone. I think
23 we would need additional help.

24 MR. ULLENSVANG: That was my attempt for Bruce
25 is to segregate the urgent life safety issues from a

1 more long-term problem, knowing that the long-term
2 problem, if we wait three or four months, it's still a
3 long-term problem. But an immediate life safety threat
4 is one we shouldn't wait three or four months on.

5 MS. BLUM: Right. The key phrase there is
6 (INAUDIBLE).

7 MR. ULLENSVANG: Right. That's how I tried to
8 phrase it. I think Bruce is pretty honest in his
9 understanding of the situation, and he will honestly
10 take that question back and see if they can put forth a
11 recommendation.

12 My expectation is that they will be reluctant to be
13 too specific in their early recommendations. That they
14 will want to review the entire package. They won't want
15 to make a mistake. They won't want to give an "it's
16 okay" and then do a full review and say, "Whoops. We
17 missed."

18 MS. BLUM: So there will be a time element.

19 MR. ULLENSVANG: I think there is another
20 organization that has the competency of their Center of
21 Excellence to do this work.

22 MS. BLUM: Okay.

23 MR. BERMAN: Is there any chance that, in view
24 of this, that you can turn around and bill the Army for
25 a preliminary look at Baker Beach, in view of this, to

1 several more hours, I'm sure. I appreciate everyone's
2 coming out tonight.

3 I think in respect for everybody's time I will
4 compile an action item list and send it around, work
5 with Mark, Craig on the committee meeting agenda.

6 Are there any other announcements or items we need
7 to talk about before we leave?

8 Then without objection the meeting is adjourned.
9 Thank you.

10 (Meeting adjourned 10:13 p.m.)

11 ---oOo---

1 assure that there is no public hazard there?

2 MR. ULLENSVANG: I heard Randy say that this
3 sort of work doesn't lend itself to field investigation
4 very well, and because it is so hit and miss -- I'm not
5 trying to define it -- but that's why they did -- they
6 learned to do the ASRs because you couldn't go out and
7 determine, in the field, the chemical issues. So I'm
8 not sure what we would do or the Trust would do and then
9 bill the Army for.

10 MR. BERMAN: Dog sniffers.

11 MR. ULLENSVANG: I suspect there's been dogs on
12 the beach that, not necessarily for this, but digging
13 for objects at beaches frequented by thousands of
14 people.

15 MS. TRIGIANI: It's probably one of the busiest
16 sites.

17 MR. ULLENSVANG: It's a very busy public area.
18 The beach is dynamic. The ocean takes and brings back
19 sand. So there's been a fair amount of movement there.

20 MR. BERMAN: Right. But it's not so much the
21 actual sandy beach. It's where the beach and the cliffs
22 meet there. That's the area of where nature has not
23 provided any cleansing.

24 MR. KERN: I really need to honor everybody's
25 time commitment tonight. We can talk about this for

1 RAB MEMBERS

2 Jerry Anderson
3 Sam Berman
4 Jan Blum
5 Bob Boggs, DTSC
6 John Budroe
7 Edward Callahan
8 Julie Cheever
9 Karen Cleek
10 Craig Cooper
11 Tony DiStefano
12 Gloria Gee
13 Julian Hultgren
14 Doug Kern
15 Jack Luikart
16 Jan Monaghan
17 Michelle Passero
18 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
19 David Sutter
20 Mary Trigiani
21 Brian Ullensvang, Park Service
22 Tracy Wright
23 Gloria Yaros
24 Mark Youngkin
25

PRESIDIO RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
THE OFFICER'S CLUB
BUILDING 50

DECEMBER 9, 2003

7:00 p.m.

---oOo---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BY: JUDY LARRABEE, REPORTER

CLARK REPORTING

2161 SHATTUCK AVENUE, SUITE 201
BERKELEY, CA 94704
510 486-0700

I've been reviewing sort of the RAB projects and have a list and some ideas for how people might want to get involved in some of those. We may talk about that later.

At the request of one of our members, I can pass this resolution out at the committee business, which is the Mountain Lake Resolution. You have a copy of the resolution that was passed in October. And so without any further ado, we'll begin.

Are there any announcements? Any old business? I know that Mark, our Co-chair is in transit. He's still downtown working his way through traffic. He wasn't at the committee meeting. And so Tracy, if you'd like to give a report on the committee meeting.

MS. WRIGHT: I'm currently looking at my notes that are not as well organized as Mark's are, but I will attempt to give the report.

We had a very well-attended committee report. It actually was probably the most people that I've seen at a meeting in a while. We had two really big items on the agenda. One was a report and a discussion by Hillary Goodman of the Presidio Trust who came in to discuss with us the issues of the Potex (PHONETIC) ballfield on Landfill E and the future use of Landfill E. It was a fabulous discussion. We were able to ask

MR. KERN: Good evening, everyone. This is the regularly scheduled meeting of the Presidio Restoration Advisory Board, our final meeting for year 2003. And I'd like to welcome everyone to the Presidio Trust and their contractors and the National Park Service, and we'll make some introductions later, some of the National Park Service folks, our regulatory community, and the Community RAB members and any members of the public that are here. Thank you for coming out tonight to view this meeting.

Before we get started then, I would like to make an introduction of a new National Park Service employee, and that's Lou Springer, a friend of mine for several years, and went away to Montana to get a master's, is now back with the Park Service. He has the equivalent job of Mark Pray, who's the guy next to him, working in Area A doing the environmental remediation site restoration planning and ecological work. Is that right, Lou?

MR. PRAY: That's right.

MR. KERN: Here's where we get to discuss all these fun projects in a community forum.

Does everyone have an agenda tonight? Are there any changes or additions? I may add something later in the meeting after the Regulatory Agency status updates.

her lots of questions.

One thing we did find out for sure, because it wasn't completely clear, was that the ballfield will be restored on Landfill E after we're finished with clean up. What wasn't clear is exactly how it will be restored. So she gave us -- and if anybody who wasn't there would like to look, I have this tonight -- a couple of the possibilities of the configurations that might take place at the landfill. So that was the first thing that we discussed.

The section major presentation was by CH2MHill, gave another fabulous presentation on their work in Cambridge Island in Seattle or off of Seattle in Washington. It's an interesting site. It wasn't necessarily a hazardous waste site so it's not equivalent to Landfill E, but a lot of people had asked questions of them regarding the process that they used for decision making and really what they did. We were fascinated that they were able to recycle so much of the material from the landfill. They gave us a report, and again if anyone would like to look at it, we have them here tonight. Also, feel free to pitch in if I've missed any big items from that.

I think those were the two main events that we discussed at the meeting, as well as a couple of things

1 in committee business. We had a quick discussion on the
 2 status of the RAB committee and we discussed
 3 possibilities of finding ways to get RAB members more
 4 involved, either through committees or other means.
 5 We'll be bringing that up in the January committee
 6 meeting, I believe.

7 We also discussed our annual social event, which
 8 isn't really annual. We haven't had one in two years.
 9 We did set a date. Hopefully you all got my
 10 save-the-date message that I sent last week. It's
 11 scheduled for Tuesday, December 16th at 7:00 o'clock at
 12 Gloria's house. We will be sending out a follow-up
 13 E-mail to let you know more details. That's next
 14 Tuesday.

15 I believe that is it. Is there anything else that
 16 I've missed? Thanks. Our next scheduled meeting, we'll
 17 not have a scheduled meeting in December, but we will
 18 have the regularly-scheduled fourth Tuesday in January.

19 MR. KERN: Thanks. Any questions for Tracy?

20 All right. On the membership committee, I think
 21 everyone may have received Dennis' resignation letter
 22 via E-mail, so there's not a lot to discuss. I guess
 23 for the record, we received his resignation letter, and
 24 Dennis made a lot of contributions so he will be missed
 25 on the RAB. We wish him well in his work in other

1 though myself and I think six staff members at the
 2 Presidio Trust work full-time on this project, but I
 3 want to say out from the very beginning there are other
 4 people that put a lot of effort to make sure that
 5 projects happen, these cleanup projects happen. And
 6 that is not only the National Park Service staff, Brian
 7 and Tony and Laura, but we have Bob and Jim from the
 8 regulators. They keep things going. And of course,
 9 input from the Community Restoration Advisory Board.

10 I have been doing this type of work for a long
 11 time, and I know that it takes all of those stakeholders
 12 pulling in the same direction to get things going. Even
 13 when that's happening, it may seem like a slow and
 14 tedious process. I just wanted to acknowledge
 15 everybody's work in 2003. It may not have been
 16 everything that we wanted to do, but once I put it all
 17 together I realized it was quite a bit.

18 I'm first going to talk about our hazardous waste
 19 sites and what happened at them in 2003. We call those
 20 our CERCLA sites. One of the big deals -- I'm just
 21 going to start talking, and feel free, anybody in the
 22 public or on the RAB, just raise your hand if you want
 23 to ask any questions. I'm going to move this along
 24 pretty quickly.

25 So one of the big deal items is that we released a

1 endeavors.

2 MS. WRIGHT: We can probably invite him to the
 3 social thing.

4 MR. COOPER: Can I talk under membership, real
 5 fast? This is a hard copy of our RAB roster. I'm going
 6 to circulate it around. Just take a look at it and make
 7 sure that we have your right address, telephone number
 8 and E-mail address. We update this every so often
 9 because people's phone numbers and E-mails change. So
 10 take a look at it and just write on this and then
 11 circulate it around back to me.

12 MR. KERN: Very good. We are moving on, unless
 13 there are any other committee items, we move on to 5.
 14 We have the Major Accomplishments, unless this has been
 15 rearranged?

16 MR. COOPER: No. I'm ready. For those who
 17 don't know me, my name is Craig Cooper and I work for
 18 the Presidio Trust. We're on Agenda Item No. 5. What
 19 I've basically done, I've combined 5A and 5B into one
 20 presentation. The focus of my presentation is going to
 21 be on what happened in the last 12 months, actually the
 22 last 12 to 15 months. This is the fiscal year 2003
 23 overview or the calendar year 2003 overview, so plus or
 24 minus, let's call it the '03 overview.

25 Before I get started, I just want to say that even

1 Feasibility Study for the main installation sites.

2 That's a group of CERCLA sites. That had been in the
 3 works for years. So that was a big milestone for us at
 4 the Presidio Trust to get that out on the street.

5 The last bullet on that slide is that we cleaned up
 6 two landfills earlier this year. We started at Landfill
 7 4 in January and immediately moved over to Fill Site 5.
 8 We moved a total of 33,000 tons of waste. The Habitat
 9 Restoration is going on at 4 at the forest and at 5 we
 10 are planting native plants.

11 Moving on in the CERCLA program. Landfill E. We
 12 released a major investigation report. We hired a new
 13 consultant, CH2MHill, that Tracy was talking about, that
 14 made a presentation at the last committee meeting, and
 15 now I think that they're off and running now in putting
 16 together this focus Feasibility Study to come up with
 17 the best remedy for Landfill E.

18 Mountain Lake. There's been a series of meetings
 19 with kind of resource stakeholders to try to figure out
 20 the best place to set up our staging areas. So we've
 21 been meeting with National Park Service people and Trust
 22 resource people to figure out where we can set up
 23 sediment -- once we dig up the contaminated sediment at
 24 Mountain Lake, we're going to need places to set up
 25 what's called "staging areas" to de-water. That's going

1 to be a big deal, because it's going to take up a couple
2 of acres of land. We've been talking to these resource
3 folks to find the best place to do that. We've made a
4 lot of progress on that.

5 We also did Building 215. It's a CERCLA site, but
6 it actually had a petroleum problem there. With the
7 cooperation of both Bob and Jim, we were able to move
8 forward and clean that site up, clean up the petroleum
9 contamination there. We have a picture of that going
10 on. That's Building 215. It's over near the former
11 Burger King building, in that area. And the Presidio
12 Trust, sometime I think next year they're going to start
13 building like a transit hub where buses and stuff like
14 that are going to come in.

15 Moving on in the CERCLA program is our -- we did a
16 RAP, which is a Remediation Action Plan. That RAP
17 covered three CERCLA sites, Baker Beach 3 and 4, which
18 are in Area A; and Fill Site 6A, which is in Area E. We
19 went through the whole Public Comment Period process,
20 had a public meeting. And we've also, just more
21 recently, we did some test pits at Baker Beach 3 and --
22 to better characterize the waste there and its waste
23 limits, and to get a better handle on that historic road
24 at Baker Beach 3.

25 We also finished the remedial design for Baker

1 Beach 3 and 4 and sent that off to the regulators. We
2 wanted to dig up Baker Beach 3 before the rain started
3 this year, and I'll talk about that at the end, about
4 our goal for next year. If you have questions on what
5 happened on that, this might be a good forum to talk
6 about that. So that's RAP 2.

7 RAP 3 is going to be a really important Remedial
8 Action Plan. It has 28 CERCLA sites in it, including
9 four really important sites in Area A: Baker Beach 1,
10 1A, 2 and 2A. I've been personally working on that a
11 lot. I'm really looking forward to presenting that to
12 you guys soon.

13 In preparation for our work on the RAP 3 sites, we
14 did some -- in 2003, we took some soil samples at the
15 four Baker Beach sites and at Nike Swale. We will be
16 issuing the data reports for both the Baker Beach 1, 2,
17 2A. That's in the data report that should go out in
18 December, and the Nike Swale data report will probably
19 come out in January.

20 There's a picture of us doing some test pits at
21 Baker Beach 3. I can't wait to dig up that site next
22 year.

23 Also going on in the CERCLA program, we got our
24 Small Arms Firing ranges sites finally going. An RI/FS
25 is a Remedial Investigation Feasibility Study. We're

1 doing the remedial investigation right now. We went out
2 and took a whole bunch of sample at these sites, and the
3 RI report, the Remedial Investigation report, it's a big
4 data report that's going to be sent to the Trust and
5 Park Service. So we should be getting that out soon.

6 At Crissy Field, as everyone knows, the Army did
7 most of the work at Crissy Field before the Trust was
8 formed. The Trust had to do some work there. We're
9 trying to basically close out all the work that the Army
10 did, both at Fill Site 7, and so we had to collect some
11 more samples at DTSC's request at Fill Site 7 to see
12 what residual contamination is left there.

13 At Crissy Field Skeet Range, which is a cleanup
14 that the Trust did back in 2002, we had some erosion
15 problems at the beach there and we brought in some --
16 that's a picture of some of the work that we did to fix
17 the erosion problems at the Skeet Range -- we brought in
18 some riprap and actually redistributed riprap along the
19 beachfront there so we don't have sand eroding away.

20 Okay. Moving on in the CERCLA program, we have a
21 group of CERCLA sites over by Public Health Service
22 Hospital. We've been writing this Five-Year Review
23 Report. Basically, it's a critique of the Army's Record
24 of Decision that was issued in 1995. We took a whole
25 bunch of samples. We are struggling in getting this

1 report out. It's been taking quite a while. I know
2 Chris Nelson of my staff is going to (INAUDIBLE) NAME
3 office tomorrow to personally check every page one last
4 time before we send it over to the Park Service
5 hopefully one last time to get it to Bob and Jim by the
6 end of December.

7 We hired a new consultant to start working on the
8 next steps at Landfills 8 and 10. It's going to be EKI
9 and they're going to start working on a Feasibility
10 Study to figure out what remedies we should implement,
11 what upgraded remedies implemented at these two sites.
12 Remember, I have to write a RAP for Landfills 8 and 10
13 and so on.

14 There's another set of CERCLA sites right next to
15 Crissy Field called the (INAUDIBLE) Housing. That clean
16 up is done, and we've sent the closeout report to the
17 regulators for their approval.

18 We did a bunch of miscellaneous projects in the
19 CERCLA Program. We finished our Wetlands Report, which
20 was a big deal for us and the Park Service. That took
21 several years of work and issued a very comprehensive
22 report of all known wetland areas in the Presidio.
23 That's both in Areas A and B.

24 We've also prepared a Contingency Action and
25 Contaminated Soil Management Plan. That's kind of the

1 fall-out of -- remember our Contingency Remedial Action
2 Work Plan, the RAW that didn't, the RAW that died a year
3 or so ago. We basically still need something like that.
4 In fact, in Jim's new Regional Board Order to the
5 Presidio, that's a requirement of the tasks that we have
6 to come up with such a plan. So we have started to work
7 on that too.

8 All right. In the Petroleum Program, we worked
9 with the Regional Board. They withdrew their old orders
10 that were against the Army that were dated in 1991 and
11 '96, and the Regional Board issued a new Order this
12 year. This was a big milestone for the Petroleum
13 Program in getting up some structure and a schedule and
14 some order to that.

15 There's two cleanup levels that we need to get in
16 our Petroleum Program. That's a task that was ordered.
17 We started working on that. One of the big deals was at
18 Building 1065 Petroleum Cleanup area. We've started an
19 Interim Clean up. That's a recent picture of what's
20 going on. Building 1065 is just behind the Swords to
21 Plowshares building parking lot, between that and
22 Gorges. I've shown a whole bunch of pictures of that at
23 last month's meeting also.

24 Also happening in the Petroleum Program, at our
25 other big petroleum areas that we call these CAP sites,

1 or Corrective Action Plan -- that's what CAP stands for,
2 Corrective Action Plan -- we did several investigations
3 to fill data gaps. At the Commissary PX and at Building
4 1349, those reports have been sent in to Jim and we've
5 gotten his okay to start writing the actual CAP
6 document, which is the RAP for the Petroleum Program.
7 So we'll be talking about getting some CAPs out the door
8 next year, which is very exciting. At 207, 231, which
9 is our last lagging CAP zone, we did a work plan. We're
10 going to start collecting soil samples in that zone next
11 year.

12 As far as underground storage tank removal, there's
13 really not that many underground storage tanks left at
14 the Presidio. The Army took out the vast majority of
15 them. The Trust, in its first couple of years, took out
16 many more. Last year, we only removed four tanks plus
17 two previously unknown tanks in Area A near Battery
18 Chamberlain. I think there's only three known tanks
19 left in the Presidio and they're in basements in
20 people's homes and we're waiting for the people to move
21 out. And then we're going to take the tank out before
22 the next tenant moves in.

23 We do occasionally, as you know, run into
24 previously unknown tanks. That happens quite a bit. In
25 fact, at our 1065 Cleanup we ran into a

1 previously-unknown tank there. At Fill Site 5, we ran
2 into a previously-unknown tank. There's a picture of a
3 tank that we removed at Building 2. That was a known
4 tank. Earlier in 2003.

5 Also in our Petroleum Program we have what's called
6 mini-CAPs, which is where a tank was pulled or there was
7 some kind of petroleum release to the soil and we needed
8 to go back and finish basically the Army's work and test
9 the soil and groundwater and do any type of cleanup
10 necessary, and we did the first group of that. I sent
11 Jim now a schedule of how we're going to roll out our
12 mini-CAP program over the next couple of years. We have
13 reviewed some portions of the FDS line here and there
14 along the way too.

15 In our Lead based Paint in Soil Program, we put
16 together our Lead and Soil Cleanup plan, which is like
17 our foggy RAP for that particular program. We sent that
18 to DTSC, who is our lead regulator for that, and the
19 stakeholders. Everybody has got a copy of that.

20 We did 26 cleanups in the year 2003 at various
21 buildings in the Presidio. We've sampled the soil at
22 around 100 buildings in the Presidio. Nina Larson of my
23 staff is the project manager for the Lead and Soil
24 Program, and so she's been pretty busy and looking
25 forward to making more progress next year. A picture of

1 some workers working on a Lead and Soil cleanup.

2 This is a little wordy one, but we have a very
3 comprehensive Groundwater Monitoring Program that we
4 continued in 2003. We monitor over 100 wells every
5 quarter. At the end of 2003, we issued a big Annual
6 Report -- well, at the end of 2002. We'll do the same
7 thing for 2003. Under the new Board Order we're now
8 going to be -- instead of quarterly reports, we'll be
9 issuing semi-annual reports. But our monitoring program
10 is still quarterly. I'll talk about that a little bit
11 in 2004, about some of my goals for that.

12 I just put that in for your own FYI, that we in
13 environmental remediation, we are oftentimes pulled into
14 other Trust projects as part-time consultants, people
15 want advice on environmental remediation or just
16 environmental issues in general. So I just put together
17 a short list of other various projects that we in
18 environmental remediation are oftentimes asked to give
19 advice on.

20 We did quite a bit of public outreach efforts in
21 2003. We upgraded our environmental web page, at
22 www.PresidioTrust.gov. We've issued, with the help of
23 the RAB, the cleanup newsletter on a quarterly basis
24 that includes the RAP report each and every time.

25 We met with y'all twice a month and we provided new

1 site tours. We're booked for a site tour tomorrow at
2 3:00. Michelle and Karen -- I don't see them -- but
3 they both said that they could make it for tomorrow
4 afternoon. I think Jack and Jan are coming too.

5 We've set up some extra meetings. We talked a lot
6 about the environmental insurance policies. We had a
7 huge membership drive for the RAB to get new members in,
8 which I thought was really successful, that we at the
9 Trust had spent some money on ads and not only the
10 Chronicle, but a bunch of neighborhood newspapers and
11 newspapers across the Bay Area. And, of course, we do
12 our best to listen to you guys and incorporate your
13 comments.

14 We have a schedule that is now -- it was basically
15 rolled out at the end of 2002 and now we've been
16 maintaining that schedule through 2003. Basically, my
17 project manager and I, we update it every six weeks, and
18 we send formal updates out to the regulators and
19 stakeholders every quarter.

20 Also in 2003, I've now sent Bob a schedule pursuant
21 to the DTSC Consent Order which are basically
22 enforceable deadlines under the Consent Order and the
23 same thing with Jim. New order. So we have some
24 specific regulatory deadlines for our program now, which
25 is a new deal for our remediation program.

1 In cost tracking, we kind of struggled along on
2 this issue in 2003, and hopefully with a happy ending.
3 Basically, George and I, we put together several Excel
4 spreadsheets in an attempt to better track our costs and
5 our budgets. But we basically just based on -- due to
6 time constraints, we just did not have the expertise or
7 the time basically to get that cost tracking system at a
8 level that we wanted to get it at.

9 So with the help of the RAB, you guys wrote a
10 letter about this. And based on information in that
11 letter, I was able to put together a position
12 description. I appreciate everyone's input on the
13 position description. I was able to incorporate just
14 about everybody's comment on the position description.
15 It's now with Trust Human Resources. They didn't have
16 any comments whatsoever, so now Craig Middleton just
17 needs to sign off on it and hopefully we'll have our own
18 remediation financial analyst early next year.

19 I meet with Zurich on a quarterly basis. Zurich is
20 an environment insurance company. Well, it's an
21 insurance company that also provides environmental
22 insurance policies. I meet with them quite a bit. We
23 track what's called unallowable costs under our cost
24 overrun insurance policy.

25 I don't want to get into too much detail about

1 that, but I really try to minimize the unallowable
2 costs. Also, when we encounter work that is not
3 explicit in the scope of work with our insurance policy
4 or I think it's in the best interest of our insurance
5 policy, I petition Zurich to try to endorse those costs.

6 As far as how much money we spent, Trust labor for
7 FYO3, that's from October 1st, 2002 to September 30th,
8 it cost about a million dollars. That's about what I
9 expected. As far as the non-labor costs, those are the
10 actual expenditures per quarter, starting at the end of
11 2002 and early 2003. Right now I'm working on my
12 expenditure report for July 1 to September 30. So that
13 kind of gives you an idea of the actual expenditures.
14 If you take a look at the labor and actual expenditures,
15 the only cost item that's not included in Trust labor
16 are the NPS costs. They are estimated to be about
17 \$220,000 a year.

18 MR. SUTTER: What is the NPS?

19 MR. COOPER: National Park Service. So if
20 they're not in Trust labor and they're not included in
21 the non-personnel costs -- like Bob's costs and Jim's
22 costs are included in those costs that I report to
23 Zurich, because those are allowable costs. Park Service
24 labor costs are non-allowable costs. They're like in
25 the same category as the Trust labor costs.

1 MR. SUTTER: So the non-personnel costs are
2 other labor costs.

3 MR. COOPER: The non-personnel are all of our
4 consultants, contractors, and Jim and Bob.

5 MR. SUTTER: Consultants, but not construction
6 contractors.

7 MR. COOPER: Oh, yeah.

8 So you can see Landfill 4 and Fill Site 5, you can
9 start to see that those costs are -- because we started
10 Landfill 4 in January. So sometime in January,
11 February, we're starting to pay invoices for Landfill 4.
12 Then I think we started Fill Site 5 in March, so March,
13 April, May, we were paying invoices on Fill Site 5. The
14 bulk of those costs from January to June, out of the
15 five million listed there, a good -- I forget what
16 George said the total amount is -- 2. something million
17 or 3 million to clean up both Landfills 4 and 5 -- but a
18 big chunk of those costs are associated with those
19 landfill remediations.

20 Okay. So that was 2003. Looking forward to 2004.
21 We've got a lot to do. We have to finish our RAP, what
22 we call RAP 2. That's the RAP for Baker Beach 3, 4 and
23 Fill Site 6A. I'm going to be sending a final version
24 of that RAP with the Trust signature on it to Bob, maybe
25 in the end of December, most likely January. So that's

1 pretty exciting. Then after DTSC signs that RAP and we
2 get their approval on our designs, we can start doing
3 the cleanups. So that first bullet is huge. That's a
4 huge amount of work just in that first bullet, for 2004,
5 to finalize the RAP and to finalize the design and to do
6 the cleanups at those three CERCLA sites.

7 Then, also in 2004, we want to do RAP 3, that's the
8 RAP with the 28 CERCLA sites in it. We definitely want
9 to do the cleanups in some of the smaller sites, and
10 we're hoping to do the cleanup at Baker Beach 1 and 2
11 before the rainy season. That's going to be tricky.
12 We've got our consultants working on the design right
13 now. But there could be some complications in getting
14 that work done before the rainy season because it's
15 going to take some time. I think everybody knows where
16 Baker Beach 1 and 2 is. It's a really steep cliff. I
17 think we've come up with a strategy on how to do that
18 cleanup, but it's going to take like three to four
19 months to do it. So it's not something we can
20 necessarily start in September or October. Anyway, more
21 on that later.

22 We've got work to do at Landfills 8 and 10. I want
23 to get the Feasibility Study out in draft form and
24 finalize that and actually get a draft RAP to DTSC
25 before the end of 2004.

1 In the Petroleum Program we've got these CAPs to
2 do, which are the RAPs for the Petroleum Program. I
3 hope to send Jim the CAP for the Commissary PX Area and
4 Building 1349 before the end of 2004. We have to finish
5 that cleanup that's already on the way at 1065.

6 Also in 2004, we've got the lead plan we want to
7 finalize, get DTSC's actual signature on that, and do at
8 least another 25 soil cleanups in 2004. We want to get
9 a Draft Feasibility study on Landfill E out the door,
10 get the RFS for the Firing Ranges going and out.

11 On Mountain Lake, we're going to be taking some
12 soil samples there to better characterize test sites and
13 something else, I forget, and get the 30 percent design
14 out, which I think was part of your resolution.

15 We need to start working on or at least thinking
16 out RAP No. 5, which would include sites such as
17 Landfill 2, Fill Site 1, sites such as those. We've got
18 to start working on that to stay on schedule, and keep
19 working on our mini-CAP and FDS removal, and continue
20 groundwater monitoring and really kind of take a look at
21 groundwater monitoring with respect to cost. It's still
22 costing the Trust about a million dollars a year for
23 both the monitoring and the reporting. So I want to
24 work with Jim to see how we can reduce costs in that
25 particular program in our groundwater monitoring.

1 There's some documents that have come out recently.
2 There's more that will probably come out later. That's
3 the end of the presentation. Any questions?

4 MS. BLUM: Craig, I'd like to ask a question
5 about the quarterly monitoring that's going to
6 semi-annual. Is that a cost-saving effort or is that --
7 tell me what that is.

8 MR. COOPER: Right. Quarterly, we go out and
9 monitor these (INAUDIBLE) monitoring wells, and then
10 what's on the semi-annual is just the reporting of it.
11 So the monitoring is still quarterly. The reporting,
12 those reports are about that thick (indicating). Thanks
13 to Jim, we now send those out now every six months. It
14 didn't really save us that much money, because we still
15 need to -- even though -- well, because the actual
16 quarterly monitoring hasn't been reduced -- I think we
17 did reduce -- we had a little bit of analyte reduction
18 in 2003, but it was very minor, and even though we do
19 the formal external reports every six months, quarterly
20 we still want to get the data into our database rapidly
21 for our consultants to use it.

22 We don't want to wait every six months to get the
23 groundwater data into our database, so as soon as a
24 quarter is done -- let's say it's a quarter that doesn't
25 have a semi-annual report associated with it --

1 internally, we at the Trust, we still pull that data
2 together, collate it, QAQC it, put it into a little mini
3 report internally, send it to the Park Service, get
4 their ideas on it and then sent it to our database guy
5 to get it into our database as soon as possible. So
6 it's still a lot of work and it's still running us at
7 about a million dollars a year.

8 MR. KERN: Other questions?

9 MS. WRIGHT: Just a comment. This summary was
10 very helpful. It was also really easy to see the 2004
11 plans and objectives. So thank you for doing this. I
12 don't know that we've had this in the past.

13 MR. COOPER: I asked Chris. He said that this
14 has never been done before, one of these kind of
15 end-of-year overviews and goals for 2004. It should be
16 interesting. Someone should save this and in December
17 2004, let's see how much -- we can pull up the slides
18 for what the goals are put together and see how many
19 actually get accomplished.

20 MS. WRIGHT: Well, it seems like it's a good
21 guideline -- (INAUDIBLE) -- realistic. But it's really
22 helpful to have this.

23 MS. CHEEVER: From the past, I think the Army
24 did one once, didn't they? I don't think they had as
25 much to report, but I think I remember that, just for

1 the record.

2 MR. KERN: Other comments?

3 MS. BLUM: I just wanted to know, and maybe I
4 missed this from the committee last time, but did Zurich
5 approve the accountant as an allowable expense, or the
6 person who is going to run the budget?

7 MR. COOPER: Not yet. I've drafted the E-mail
8 for them, but my attorney is looking at it right now.
9 So I haven't even sent it to Zurich yet. They know,
10 because I've told them over the phone, and every RAB
11 meeting there's a representative from Zurich here at
12 this meeting. And so they know this is coming and they
13 know it's important to me. They actually said the next
14 time I meet with Zurich, I think is in January, the
15 14th -- I definitely want to get my E-mail to them in
16 December so we can talk about that in January. That
17 will be important.

18 MS. BLUM: A full-time job; is that correct,
19 with benefits?

20 MR. COOPER: Full time, with benefits. And
21 actually, I decided not to make it a term appointment.
22 At first I was going to make it one year, but the people
23 from HR said that scares away a lot of talented people
24 when they see that. So I decided to make it a
25 full-time, theoretically in-perpetuity job. I keep

1 forgetting, at the Presidio Trust we are all at-will
2 employees, unlike your standard federal employee. Like
3 when I was at EPA, it was really hard to get fired from
4 there. I keep forgetting that. But at the Presidio
5 Trust, we could all get laid off at any point in time,
6 as we're learning every year since we've had layoffs two
7 years in a row now.

8 So the person from HR said that really wasn't
9 necessary to call it a term appointment. So let's just
10 monitor how that goes. If we feel that after a year or
11 two that we've got a system -- because I put it right
12 into the person's position description, as you guys
13 know, that there's training involved. This person that
14 we're hiring is going to train myself and people in
15 Trust accounting to once they get this system set up to
16 basically turn it over. So in other words, they're
17 going to work themselves out of a job eventually. But
18 let's see how that goes.

19 MR. ANDERSON: Where would this be advertised?

20 MR. COOPER: HR takes it from there. I guess
21 they post it on their -- do we have a vacancy
22 announcement on our website?

23 MR. KERN: Yeah.

24 MR. SUTTER: It will be advertised in local
25 newspapers too, right?

1 MR. COOPER: I don't know. It's a good
2 question. I'll ask.

3 MR. SUTTER: Like the Chronicle.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Craig, have you thought about
5 staffing for RAP 2 and RAP 3? Are there going to be
6 different project managers on that?

7 MR. COOPER: It's just us. One thing that we
8 did internally in our -- me being a manager, we had a
9 little internal brainstorming where we kind of
10 white-boarded all of the RAP 3 projects, because they
11 needed project managers. I white-boarded everyone's
12 current workload and then decided to put projects under
13 people's names. So all those sites, all the RAP 3 sites
14 have Trust project managers.

15 I'm the project manager for the RAP, and then
16 George has some of them. I think Chris might have some.
17 And actually Nina Larson, who is the Lead based Paint
18 person, has a few of the small RAP 3 sites because
19 they're actually just metal-contaminated soils which
20 she's experienced in cleaning up.

21 I would love to hire more people, but it's really
22 not in the interest of our program to hire more people.

23 MS. MONAGHAN: The other question I had was
24 about Landfill 8 and 10, hiring EKI to do that work. Do
25 you think that that's going to make it shorter and

1 faster?

2 MR. COOPER: Yeah. That was my thinking is
3 that they know -- there's no learning curve with them.
4 With Hill, I wanted to bring a new one on, because just
5 to let all the consultants know that they aren't going
6 to get all the jobs. But there is a learning curve any
7 time you bring on a consultant. I think with E we have
8 some luxury to take our time and get that project
9 through. That's why I want to bring on somebody
10 completely new.

11 But at 8 and 10, as you know, we don't have a lot
12 of luxury with time on that one. So EKI knows the
13 Presidio really well. There's no learning curve with
14 them. I personally am really generally satisfied with
15 their work products. They are ready to get going. All
16 the paperwork is in place. So we just need to get that
17 Five-Year Review out and they're going to get running on
18 that Feasibility Study.

19 We'll definitely have a kick-off meeting just like
20 we did with Landfill E. We'll have a Landfill 8 and 10
21 Feasibility Study Kick-off Meeting. Once EKI puts some
22 draft alternatives together, we'll sit down either at a
23 special meeting or at a RAB meeting and talk about that.

24 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I think you mentioned
25 that you had taken some new (INAUDIBLE) in the Disturbed

1 Areas 3 and 4. Did you report what you found?
2 MR. COOPER: At Baker Beach 3 -- you mean the
3 test pits?

4 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Yes.

5 MR. COOPER: Yes. We were basically sampling
6 for lead, because that has been a problem for us --
7 well, not a problem. It's the key contaminant that
8 determines the hazardous waste characteristics for
9 off-site disposal. We sampled for total lead and we
10 sampled it for the hazardous waste test, the State and
11 Federal hazardous waste test. I don't know the results.
12 Sorry about that.

13 We also sampled to find the elevation of the
14 historical road. I don't think we went down to native
15 soil. But the report on that is -- I just overheard
16 George talking about getting the cover letter together,
17 so the report on the Baker Beach 3 test pit should be
18 coming out by the end of December.

19 Then you also heard we need work on Area A
20 projects. Our testing for Baker Beach 1 and 2 is coming
21 out also very soon. Contact Brian to get copies of
22 those reports if you want to see what's in the waste in
23 those Area A sites.

24 You should probably take a look at our Five-Year
25 Review for Landfills 8 and 10, because Landfill 10 is in

1 so I guess we should go back to quarterly.

2 MR. COOPER: It's helpful.

3 MR. PONTON: So I guess we should kind of
4 review all the wells that were -- (INAUDIBLE) -- on a
5 semi-annual basis for the wells and maybe some even on
6 an annual basis, but at least on an semi-annual basis
7 after a dry and a wet season. So I think Bob and I can
8 look at that and we certainly accept that. So maybe we
9 can reduce it by some amount and make that a goal.

10 The first group of mini-CAP reports which were for
11 the buildings, which are down this way, the old barracks
12 on the (INAUDIBLE) grounds. I met with my ex-supervisor
13 and he agrees that there should be No Further Action
14 sites. So I'll write that letter on behalf of our new
15 executive officer. That was my goal to get that out by
16 the end of the year. So I was working on that now. So
17 that's about it.

18 The 1065 site, I think Brian is going a good job
19 there. We've been out there a couple of times. It's a
20 big hole. But it's really good to see that all being
21 dug up because that should speed things along in the
22 future. I'm happy about that. Thank you.

23 MR. O'HARA: Jim, with respect to the
24 monitoring of the wells, is that generally an open-ended
25 proposition or is there some closure somewhere down the

1 Area A. So I'm sure that's going to be another project
2 that you're going to work on.

3 MR. KERN: Any other questions? Thanks, Craig.
4 Did you have anything else? I noticed budget and
5 schedule was on the tail end of that. Was that included
6 in there?

7 MR. COOPER: That's it.

8 MR. KERN: We're on to Item 6. Regulatory
9 Agency Status Updates/Inputs. Bob.

10 MR. BOGGS: Not a lot to add. The only thing
11 that is of public interest is we have a meeting next
12 Wednesday set up with my management and our legal staff
13 regarding Mountain Lake. I will keep you posted.

14 MR. KERN: Jim.

15 MR. PONTON: I agree. It's been a really good
16 year for everyone here and for the project. I know
17 Craig mentioned that in his recently-released documents
18 there is one document that's not here, and that's one
19 that was submitted for the development of acceptable
20 range measure (INAUDIBLE). It's a work plan for
21 freshwater, the freshwater water corridor in Tennessee
22 Hollow. So that's another deliverable that we received
23 that was a task of the recent Order.

24 Then in terms of -- I didn't really know that the
25 reduced reporting wasn't really saving that much money,

1 line on the necessity of the monitor? What is the focus
2 there?

3 MR. PONTON: I think generally whenever there's
4 impacts to water, until those impacts are remedied or
5 until they've reached the goals that have been set in
6 either RAPS or in CAPs or in other decision documents,
7 there will always be a monitoring component. But
8 as times goes on -- you know, through this process we've
9 acquired a database that's so huge that we've been told
10 that we're probably not going to see any surprises. So
11 based on that data set that we've gathered over the
12 years, we can select key wells. So maybe we'll have ten
13 wells monitoring sites. So you can reduce that to
14 possibly three downgradient wells on a less frequent
15 basis.

16 But as long as there's a plume left in the
17 groundwater, generally we require monitoring and
18 tracking of that into the future. So there will always
19 be some component of monitoring here.

20 But in terms of the aggressive monitoring that's
21 been done and then picked up from when the Army
22 monitored the site, we can drop off on some of those
23 because we have a good data set to show that there's no
24 surprises.

25 MR. KERN: Anything else? Thanks.

1 We're going rather quickly. We're near the end of
 2 the meeting. Maybe it would be a good moment to talk a
 3 little bit further about some of the projects that will
 4 be upcoming for the RAB in 2004 and just get people
 5 thinking about how we might organize around those
 6 projects. All these projects in some way mirror Craig's
 7 goals for 2004. So there's a nice -- it's really nice
 8 that you would preview all of our projects. Of course,
 9 our projects are your projects.

10 MR. COOPER: They're our projects.

11 MR. KERN: Yes. One giant group project.

12 So I'll just list some of these. My favorite topic
 13 to start off, Landfill E, of course. Mark has generated
 14 a nice set of initial comments that we may be able to
 15 use as a way to bring everybody to a certain point on
 16 technical issues around the landfill, because a lot of
 17 this revolves around the actual technical details in
 18 these reports.

19 Another comment in general that deserves a lot of
 20 work -- and perhaps it would be a massive group project
 21 here -- would be the groundwater wells around Landfill E
 22 and how we might all participate in reviewing that data,
 23 producing graphs, some sort of shared misery project,
 24 because there's a lot of data, a lot of wells. It would
 25 be a good educational project. Hopefully, just -- and

1 maybe responding a little bit to Jim, if I could throw
 2 in maybe a preemptive comment, hopefully Landfill E
 3 wells will stay fairly quarterly.

4 Landfill E, just that whole group coming together,
 5 we're going to have as quickly a process as possible
 6 with CH2MHill, and so building some sort of a group
 7 thing there.

8 Mountain Lake, we've already gotten a big start on
 9 with our resolution. I was prompted appropriately last
 10 time to bring copies of the resolution to this meeting.
 11 If anybody would like one, if you don't have one, I can
 12 pass that out. Would anybody like the actual copy of
 13 the resolution? There's more up here.

14 I also said I would put out just a brief strategy
 15 paper. Here's some ideas. There's nothing new on the
 16 Mountain Lake strategy, but we can talk about it just
 17 briefly.

18 This resolution has already been helpful in a lot
 19 of ways. We're seeing activity, and I want to honor all
 20 that activity that's been shown by the Trust and the
 21 regulatory agencies and the Park Service. So as we look
 22 down at the resolution where it says, "at an appropriate
 23 time in the near future we will do certain actions,"
 24 that's something that perhaps a group around Mountain
 25 Lake has to really key into as to what are the timing of

1 these things.

2 So I just put out various obvious things. Check in
 3 with the interested agencies. Bob reported tonight that
 4 they're going to have a meeting next week. I think
 5 Jim's agency is involved. The Trust is gathering their
 6 folks. So we're kind of getting this part of it along
 7 the way and we're kind of getting a judge on their time.

8 The next part, we generally know what groups would
 9 be interested and we can kind of commit this to paper
 10 and identify the people and the phone numbers and start
 11 thinking about who we might want to contact in terms of
 12 the community groups and individuals who would be
 13 interested in this project.

14 Just backing up -- sorry for the confusion -- one
 15 group that we haven't really talked to that's very
 16 interested in Mountain Lake is the Golden Gate National
 17 Parks Conservancy because they're doing the restoration.
 18 So they will be a key group to be involved in all of
 19 that.

20 I'm down to the third bullet. Identify these
 21 initial funding possibilities. There's not a lot of
 22 detail here, but I think Michelle and others have
 23 already identified possible other funding avenues, and
 24 Jim has brought some to our attention too, that we could
 25 look at getting to fund different activities. And

1 that's the next bullet point, the cleanup and the storm
 2 drain diversion.

3 So getting a group together to look at all these
 4 and then create a fact sheet basically that has a brief
 5 history, current conditions, what are the issues that
 6 we'd like to see done and something that we can hand to
 7 people, that's going to need to be created. Hopefully
 8 with a product there's going to be letters of support
 9 from all of our interested parties directed at the
 10 people that we've identified at the right time. So it's
 11 a broad sort of vague thing that needs to be tightened
 12 up.

13 George.

14 MR. DIES: You mentioned Golden Gate. They
 15 can't develop an independent restoration strategy. They
 16 have to work under -- (INAUDIBLE) -- restoration
 17 strategies.

18 MR. COOPER: Correct.

19 MR. DIES: The volunteer workforce to
 20 implement.

21 MR. KERN: Well, actually what I mean by
 22 restoration would be the actual ecological restoration.

23 MR. DIES: That's what I meant. I thought
 24 their experts determined it.

25 MR. KERN: The part that I would be citing --

1 now about Craig, they do the digging up and hauling away
2 and then --

3 MR. DIES: I'm sorry. A sister group. Isn't
4 there a ecological group inside the Trust?

5 MR. COOPER: Inside the Trust, yeah.
6 Terri Thomas's group, and then this Golden Gate National
7 Park's Conservancy is like a sister agency with the
8 National Park Service.

9 We've been involved -- in one of my slides, I
10 talked about Mountain Lake and how we've been talking to
11 these resource folks, and it's been Park Service
12 Resource people, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy
13 resource people, and Trust. Terri Thomas, Michael Bowl
14 and those folks.

15 MR. DIES: I don't want to belabor it, but your
16 guys have to write up the plan, right?

17 MR. COOPER: For the remediation, yes. And
18 then Terri Thomas and the Parks Service writes up the
19 plan for the revegetation.

20 MR. DIES: Okay.

21 MS. CHEEVER: You used the word agency though.
22 The Conservancy is not an agency.

23 MR. COOPER: Right.

24 MS. CHEEVER: It's a citizens' group. It's
25 maybe analogous to Friends of the Parks and Recreation

1 in the city system or -- (INAUDIBLE). They can give
2 their own proposals for --

3 MR. DIES: They can give their own proposal,
4 but they aren't writing the official one.

5 MR. COOPER: Correct. They're acting in an
6 advisory way. That's Carol Prince and so on.

7 MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: And the Conservancy
8 there, like many other Park Range Associations with many
9 of the parks across the country, are a nonprofit
10 organization, but they did do a lot of fundraising and
11 organizations with volunteer work. So they do a lot of
12 the work that the Park Service is not able to do in
13 localizing funds and labor and support to get the work
14 done that agencies make the plans for and the regulatory
15 agencies to approve.

16 MR. KERN: Many of the projects that we've
17 worked on have various aspects of policy in science and
18 legal, and they're all in different time lines. So part
19 of our discussion on how we organize will be around,
20 well, do we have everybody who is interested in Mountain
21 Lake kind of work on Mountain Lake and work across all
22 these different areas? Or do we have committees that
23 work on, say, policy or outreach and have all the
24 individual projects? It's just how does it organize
25 without trying to decide that. We can get to that at

1 some point.

2 I didn't intend to bring this Mountain Lake thing
3 up so we would actually discuss it, but I did want to
4 get it out to people so you can look at it and we can,
5 for the New Year, begin to organize and get some sense
6 of how that's going to shape up.

7 Other projects that are available to us. The
8 Archive Search Report, I've had the opportunity to have
9 this document for a little while, I've discovered that
10 even though it's this thick (indicating), the actual
11 report is about this thick (indicating), the writing of
12 it. The rest are sort of appendices. So what's
13 interesting is this part tries to summarize all the rest
14 of the research they did. So part of what we've done on
15 this Board is actually then go through all the data
16 ourselves and offer alternative analysis or concur or
17 disagree or whatever. That's a big project.

18 Those of you who are interested in bullets and
19 bombs and guns and things, there's a whole section that
20 just describes that. We may have experts who might like
21 to see what was used here. There are other interesting
22 sections that just have an order, a page, like from the
23 Colonel that was given to the troops that said, "You
24 will assemble at a certain time for hand grenade
25 practice." That sort of stuff is in here, and it's kind

1 of interesting for those of you who are history buffs.

2 But also embedded in this will be the data that
3 we're looking for, particularly around some of these
4 sites, Baker Beach, things like that.

5 There would be interesting ways to divide this up
6 for people that were be so inclined. I just want to
7 say, I'm really interested in having people help out
8 with looking at this.

9 Of course we've had a lot of interest in the
10 schedule and cost tracking, so that's had a lot of
11 self-organizing that could fall into an ongoing
12 committee.

13 A couple of other major projects that I saw that
14 Craig mentioned, Landfill 8 and Landfill 10. I think it
15 would be really good for us to be prepared for that, and
16 there's still kind of this outstanding Five-Year Review
17 report that has the data. So whoever is going to be
18 really interested in Landfill 8 and 10 needs to be able
19 to get ahold of that data and -- because we've been
20 hearing that there may be a need to have a new remedy.
21 So it would be good for us to get caught up on the
22 reasons.

23 I think we're still going to be faced down the road
24 with the issue of the cemetery below 8 and whatever else
25 comes up. We know at Landfill 10 it's got a very steep

1 face, and how that face might be carved back or moved.
 2 So those are important issues for people interested
 3 in Landfill 8 and 10, and it's obviously going to come
 4 up very quickly given a lot of interest in the Public
 5 Health Service Hospital site.

6 Building 207/231. Craig mentioned as a CAP,
 7 Corrective Action Plan, part of the Petroleum, it's a
 8 series of plumes that happen to be right in the
 9 Tennessee Hollow, in the mouth of that as it goes
 10 towards the marsh. There's been a lot of history with
 11 that site here within the RAB, participating on it,
 12 consensus building. That was back in the Army days. So
 13 as that CAP gets developed, that may would be another
 14 site that we may want to organize around, pick up the
 15 technical details about it.

16 Those are some highlights where we may want to be
 17 organizing in the best way that we can. I'm certainly
 18 going to be open to input on how that's done. And so I'm
 19 going to welcome everyone's participation and perhaps
 20 even ask for your participation.

21 I think the shared-misery approach, particularly on
 22 Landfill E, is if everybody can commit to doing a little
 23 bit, it might turn out to actually be a lot of fun. It
 24 would be sort of one of those bonding exercises. You
 25 look back and, "Remember when we did that Landfill E

1 report? It was so awful. We were up late at night.
 2 People were pulling their hair out. People didn't want
 3 to talk to Doug for months after that."

4 Any comments at this point? So that's just stuff
 5 to work on during Christmas holidays, in your dreams be
 6 thinking about that.

7 Item No. 7. New business. We have a tour
 8 tomorrow. Would there be any other folks that would be
 9 interested, perhaps, in going? You can talk to Craig if
 10 there is any interest.

11 We have the RAB Social next Tuesday night. Perhaps
 12 since we've had a number of people arrive since you gave
 13 your report, would you like to repeat anything else?

14 MS. WRIGHT: The RAB Social. We sent out a
 15 save-the-date message by E-mail. Hopefully everybody
 16 got that. It will be at the house of Gloria Yaros.
 17 Gloria and I will be sending out a message probably in
 18 the next two days, by E-mail. If there's anyone who'd
 19 like to get that message in another way, just let one of
 20 us know. It will give you directions to her house and
 21 what to bring. We'd like to invite everyone to bring a
 22 guest. It's just a casual holiday thing. It will be
 23 fun. Gloria, anything else you want to add?

24 MS. YAROS: No. Do feel free to bring a guest
 25 if you'd like. You certainly don't have to.

1 MR. KERN: Are there any parking issues that we
 2 might all be aware of?

3 MS. YAROS: No. I thought there was going to
 4 be, but we lucked out because Wednesday is street
 5 cleaning on the opposite side of my street, so all those
 6 people will have moved their cars. All the people
 7 across the street from me will have moved their cars off
 8 of the street Tuesday night because Wednesday morning
 9 the street cleaner comes by. We lucked out. Otherwise,
 10 there would have been no parking.

11 MR. KERN: 7C. There's no committee meeting in
 12 December, but there is the Social next week.

13 Action items. I think the primary action item is
 14 to have a safe and wonderful holiday season and to give
 15 thanks for this great year that we've had and look
 16 forward to a new year coming up.

17 Any other action items?

18 Agenda items. I think Tracy has mentioned one that
 19 we've kind of elaborated on a little bit, trying to
 20 organize around these big projects, whether it's
 21 committee, working group or individual site projects. A
 22 lot of it, hopefully, will come from you, where your
 23 interests are, and maybe there will be sort of
 24 self-selecting people that will just draw to each other.
 25 Then where that doesn't happen, we'll do some

1 organizing.

2 But agenda items, that will be on one, and then
 3 we'll get new agenda items from Mark.

4 MS. MONAGHAN: Do you think that the Baker
 5 Beach test pit information will be available by the
 6 January meeting?

7 MR. COOPER: Yes.

8 MS. BLUM: Test pit?

9 MR. COOPER: Soil samples.

10 MR. KERN: I guess the interest there is if we
 11 get any high lead.

12 Are there any other comments before we close?

13 Thanks again for coming out on this rainy December
 14 evening. If we don't see you next Tuesday, have a nice
 15 holiday, Happy New Year and see you next year.

16 (Adjourned 8:30.)
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

RAB MEMBERS ATTENDING

- 1
- 2 Jerry Anderson
- 3 Jan Blum
- 4 Bob Boggs, DTSC
- 5 Julie Cheever
- 6 Craig Cooper
- 7 George Dies
- 8 Tony DiStefano
- 9 Doug Kern
- 10 Jack Luikhart
- 11 Jan Monaghan
- 12 Peter O'Hara
- 13 Jim Ponton, Regional Water Board
- 14 David Sutter
- 15 Tracy Wright
- 16 Gloria Yaros
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25